

THE MONTHLY REPOSITORY

AND

REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, No. LII.

APRIL, 1831.

PHYSICAL CONSIDERATIONS CONNECTED WITH MAN'S ULTIMATE DESTINATION.*

THERE are three ways of regarding the condition of the human being after death, each of which has its advocates, since the subject presents but a choice of difficulties. Men will not cease to speculate on a subject in which each has an individual interest, though a very scanty portion of evidence can, from the nature of the case, be obtained at present, and science, both physical and metaphysical, must have advanced to a degree which we can scarcely anticipate before any thing like certainty can be established as to the essence of human identity, the mode in which that identity is preserved, and the circumstances by which it shall be surrounded after death. There are a multitude of accessories to the interest which attends this very obscure inquiry. A being, whose individual fate was in no way involved in the question,—one who could contemplate humanity without being subject to its ordinary conditions—the Wandering Jew, for instance, or St. Leon—could not but feel a stirring curiosity about the destination of such a creature as man, after it was known that death is not the end of being. He would look on him one day, every fibre thrilling with life; and every limb, powerful in its muscular strength, made tenfold more powerful by the direction given to that strength by some internal existence made known only through its controul over the outward man. He would look on him again and see the external frame, fearfully wonderful in the delicacy of its organization, but cold, insensible, tending to decay; and as for the power within—what and where is it? Is it asleep? Is it departed? Is it there, conscious and watchful, though in no way manifested to the observer? How intense, how irritating would be the curiosity such a wanderer of the earth would feel as he tracked the steps of death age after age through many climes, keeping

* An Essay on such Physical Considerations as are connected with Man's Ultimate Destination; the Essential Constitution of Superior Beings; and the Presumptive Unity of Nature. By Andrew Carmichael, M. R. I. A. Dublin. 1830.

him ever in sight, watching the direction of his dart, but ever blinded by an envious cloud at the precise moment of observation ! This would be one of the greatest evils of a deathless sojourn among dying men ; to hear all other mourners comforting one another with the certainty of a speedy departure ; to see every other speculator relaxing his brow of thought at the suggestion that this mystery could not be long hidden ; to close the eyes of the last of a band of intellectual brethren, and say, "I alone am left to wonder and doubt for ever."—A being whose individual interest is involved in the question, who knows that his ignorance is only temporary, feels a curiosity not the less lively for its being hopeful. His observation becomes more keen as he sees one after another taken from the multitude of gazers without, and vanishing beneath the cloud which he shall also enter ere long. Age after age has this cloud hung low on the gate of life, and if men have not learned what there is on the other side, they have at least determined in some degree what is *not* there.

The condition of the human being after death depends, of course, on the essence of his being ; and as long as we can only guess at the essence, we can only speculate on the state. Since it is supposed that there is only one alternative respecting the essence of man, it has usually, but erroneously, been concluded that there is also but one alternative respecting the time and mode of entrance upon a future life. The essence of man, it is said, is either matter or spirit. Granted ; since by spirit nothing more is meant than that which is not matter.—If spirit, the essential portion of the human being must be immortal, must be separated from the destructible portions at death, and enter immediately on its future state. Granted. If matter, the human being remains unconscious, in fact temporarily annihilated, till the life-giving decree shall go forth again to inspire the whole race with an immortal life. Not granted. It may be so, but not necessarily ; there is yet a third supposition. But we will consider each in its turn, deducing our reasonings from facts rather than from philosophical speculations on matter and spirit : since, till we know the meaning of the terms in which they are conducted, such speculations will afford but an unstable basis for argument. All agree that the nature of spirit is wholly unascertainable ; but few bear in mind that matter is also a mere abstract term, under which are congregated many things which we in some measure understand, and many more which we do not. We will say nothing, therefore, about whether spirit is capable of a union with matter, whether matter may or may not be endowed with life and thought, &c., and will pass on to the facts (few though they be, and obscure in their interpretation) with which we are furnished by observation and testimony.

The first facts to which it is natural to have recourse are those which are exhibited by the various forms of death. All instances of sudden death are not apparently inconsistent with the notion of a separable soul, and by their peculiar suggestions have no doubt cherished the idea, if not helped to originate it. What more natural (the conception of an indestructible being residing in a destructible frame having been once admitted) than to look on a body suddenly become motionless as a body *vacated*, and to exclaim, "See the shell of a flown bird !" What more natural than to suppose, when the "strong swimmer" sinks instantaneously after his last convulsive effort, that his spirit parted in the agony and clave the waters and the invisible air upwards more swiftly than its perishing companion sunk to the caves of the deep ? What more natural than to regard the last vivid glance of the expiring martyr as a silent though eloquent token that the soul had

spread its wings for flight, and was bidding adieu to suffering and humanity at once ?

In cases of gradual decline, it is less easy to the imagination to picture to itself the state of the spiritual essence during the gradual approach of dissolution. We know that the decay of the mind, the relaxation and final suspension of muscular power, the failure of all the organs in succession, are caused by affections of the brain and the nerves connected with it. Is it the life which fails and decays, or does the immaterial portion of the frame remain in its integrity while all its outward manifestations are obscured ? Can it be that while torpor is stealing over the limbs, and dulness impairing the ear and the eye, the spiritual principle is awake and observant,—that there is a bright sensibility within, while all is verging upon death without ? We know that it is not so. We have all had experience of sleep, of faintings, of debility ; and we know that if there be a spiritual principle unsusceptible of injury, it is not detected by our experience, our state in sleep and illness being the same as if mind and body were one. If the immaterial portion of the frame be susceptible of disease in exact proportion with the material part, where is its advantage over matter ; what evidence is there for it ; or rather, what evidence is there not against it ?

The facts connected with disease and modes of death certainly afford no evidence of an immaterial principle in man ; and the same may be said of those presented by the various instances on record of translation and resurrection. There is no hint in the case of Elijah of his body being any where deposited when the spirit left it, and resumed when he appeared to the disciples on the mount of transfiguration ; and if his presence had been wholly spiritual on that mount, it could not have been an *appearance* to the bodily eyes of the gazers, for pure spirit cannot be visible. In the three cases of restoration to life at the command of Jesus there is no suggestion of any departed spirit being recalled to inhabit the body ; and in the instance of the resurrection of Christ himself, messengers, whose radiance was apparent to the eye, whose voices were audible to the ear, were sent to roll away the stone, and release the captive of death. Now, as they were recognized by human senses, these messengers could not have been purely spiritual, according to philosophical definitions of spirit : and as these messengers were sent to open the mouth of the cave, it is a fair presumption that matter is acted upon only by matter, except in the case of the One Being whom alone we must necessarily suppose to be spiritual. If the spirit of Jesus had returned to inhabit the inclosed body, what need would there have been of messengers to assist, if those messengers are supposed spiritual ? And it is monstrous to imagine them material, and man spiritual. The easiest interpretation of the whole case is surely to suppose that all were material agents (however etherialized) of the One Spirit through whom all was done.

The other supposition which has divided opinion is, that man, being wholly material, falls into a state of unconsciousness at death, which continues, and must continue, till, at some awful future period, there shall be a revivification of every human body. That the first part of this supposition is correct there can be little doubt. The resemblance of death to a deep sleep has suggested the idea almost universally ; and it is confirmed by the silence of all who have ever been restored to life as to their experience of death. It may, indeed, be conjectured that all impressions received in an ulterior state must necessarily be obliterated when the body is reinstated in its mortal conditions ; but this is a mere hypothesis, and scarcely a tenable

one. The greater probability undoubtedly is, that all was a blank from the moment of ceasing to breathe to the moment of breathing again. But the supposition that this unconsciousness remains till a far distant period, when all who have lived will be reanimated at once, is attended with insuperable difficulties, and with no substantial evidence whatever.

Who that looks round him or calculates for a moment can suppose that human bodies can be raised entire? We all speculate somewhat in Hamlet's mode when we watch the revolutions of churchyards. We see how the earthy barriers between the graves are broken through, how dust is mingled with dust till all becomes an indistinguishable mass; how, in course of time, the foundations of dwellings for the living are laid among the ruined abodes of the dead; how, when these dwellings have also crumbled away, the plough turns up the clods, and food is raised from the elements of a former organization to nourish frames which must afford the same service in their turn. Other changes succeed. When generations have reaped their living harvests from the harvest-field of death, green pastures are spread, or still waters expand, or the sea comes sweeping over all, and a new species of vegetation begins in the hollows, and a new influx of life pervades the scene of so many vicissitudes. Thus is it in every region. The caravan of the desert leaves no trace of its perished thousands when the moist wind and the dry, the jackal and the carrion bird, have done their work. The sunken vessel, with all that it contained of human or inanimate, is dissolved into its elements before the neighbouring coral reef has been built up to the surface. And what is to be said of cannibalism, where one human frame is immediately incorporated with another? The resurrection of each entire human body is manifestly impossible.

But, it is maintained, though the body may not be raised entire, some portion of it may be indestructible: some indistinguishable atom may be preserved in a state of organization from which life may be at length evolved, and in which a consciousness of identity may be renewed.

On the fate of indistinguishable atoms we certainly cannot speak positively; but it is reasonable to require some evidence of the existence of the kind supposed. We know of no such evidence, and perceive no need of such a supposition. The Mahometans and Jews held the same doctrine; but as their notions were grosser than ours, their choice of the indestructible part was more open to refutation. They each fixed on a certain bone which was to be incapable of decay, and prepared to sprout up into a complete human form in the fulness of time. These bones, however, were found to crumble into dust like other bones, and the conjecture was overthrown, as would probably be that of these other speculators, if their "atoms" were not "indistinguishable" and therefore beyond the reach of argument and testimony.

Thus much, however, may be said,—that if only a particle remains to be revived, its renewal of life, or development, or whatever else it may be called, is something wholly different from that resurrection of the body which is contended for on Scripture grounds. It cannot be supposed to be the doctrine which Paul had in mind when he wrote on the subject to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians; it removes to the furthest limit the analogy between the resurrections of the gospel history and our own. It is not only a mere hypothesis, but it is as much discountenanced by Scripture as the doctrine of a separate soul.

There is yet a third supposition, which, though not free from difficulties, avoids the most perplexing which beset the other two, and as it was prima-

rily suggested by Scripture, is by far the most easily reconcileable with the most important class of facts to which we can appeal. On this supposition, man is and ever shall be material, his frame being made susceptible of change according to his change of state : as expressed by Paul, "there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body : " or as we may explain it, there is a gross body, and there is an etherealized body. The unconsciousness of death may thus last only while the ethereal body is evolved from the gross inanimate one, and we have at once an explanation of most of the Scripture expressions which have been given over as inexplicable by one or other party or both, and thus the facts also of Scripture present comparatively little difficulty.

A while ago, this doctrine would have been objected to on the ground of physical impossibility ; but the extraordinary advancement of chemical science within a short period has made men cautious of pronouncing on physical impossibilities. The evolutions which have been detected of invisible substances from bodies which thenceforth tend to dissolution, the transmutations of various substances into one another and into others wholly different, the apparent transformations when known elements are combined in new modes, present results which would formerly have been far less credible to the ignorant, than the doctrine in question need be to us who are confessedly as much in the dark about some elements of the human frame as the peasantry of a century ago respecting various subtle substances with which science has rendered us familiar. By the doctrine in question, the phenomena of disease and death are made easy of explanation on the grounds which the materialist has ever firmly occupied, while the objections to the state ensuing, on which the immaterialist has seldom been satisfactorily answered, do not apply. The body is, as he supposes, destined to decay without any design of revival ; it need not, as he says, perplex us to see it pass through a succession of forms, the same particles, perhaps, constituting in turn the limbs, the heart, the brain, of many living creatures ; it need not, prospectively, give us concern to imagine that what was once Alexander may bung a beer barrel, or that "Imperial Cæsar, dead and turned to clay, might stop a hole to keep the wind away." It remains to compare the supposition with Scripture facts, and afterwards with Scripture reasonings.

There is evidently nothing to contradict it in the cases of the daughter of Jairus and of the young man of Nain, and of those who were raised by the apostles from death which had just taken place : and though it may appear vain to speak of what seems most *natural* in miraculous cases, it will be acknowledged to be more easily conceivable that the process of bodily change should be delayed or reversed in such instances, than that the spirit should be recalled from a new state of which it retained not the slightest impression. We are not destitute of something like evidence that this change does not begin at once, or is at first slow, or easily reversible. Persons apparently drowned have been revived when every indication of life had some time ceased ; and inferior animals, if not men, have been restored by galvanism when they had been confidently pronounced dead ; in the case of small animals, we know, to the astonishment if not the horror of the operator. It will be said they were not dead. Certainly, according to our common notion of death, because they lived again without miraculous intervention. But what is it then to be dead ? Where can the line be drawn short of the obvious commencement of decay ? Would these bodies, if not acted upon, have given any further sign of change previous to decay ? Was any token of death absent, any intimation of lingering life discernible ?

Surely not. The restoration of the youth and maiden of the gospel history was effected by a word spoken, and was therefore unquestionably miraculous; all that we mean to intimate is, that the internal change was probably less than in the other cases to which we are about to turn; probably only such as we might understand if our knowledge of chemical processes were what it promises to become. The case of Lazarus is a more difficult one. Whether there was obvious decay, as his sister apprehended; whether in so peculiar a case the process of change was retarded; or whether the time required for this process varies with the varieties of bodily constitution, we know not. Any of these suppositions are probable. The first two are perfectly consistent with the miraculous character of the entire event, and the last has in its favour very strong presumption from analogy. Any one is more probable than that the separate soul of Lazarus was taken from among the blessed, steeped in some nameless Lethe, and restored to its prison "newly swept and garnished" for its reception.

As the time required for obvious change in the dead body varies extensively with the circumstances of natural constitution, climate, the nature of the mortal disease or accident, &c., it seems very probable that the change of death is in proportion rapid or slow in its completion. In Jesus, it appears to have been completed in forty hours; in Lazarus, to have been unfinished in four days, if he was indeed unconscious during the whole time that he was in the sepulchre, which, as we have before said, we do not doubt. This difference between the two cases makes no difficulty as long as other obvious differences in the state of the inanimate body exist likewise. A more important part of the inquiry is as to their comparative state when they came forth from their dark and cold abodes. Lazarus was as before, a mortal. He lived, as formerly, among mortals, destined to die like them; and he died, as tradition relates, thirty years after his first restoration. With Jesus, all was different. He came and went, he appeared and withdrew, but dwelt no more in the abodes of men, and was manifestly no longer subject, though he benevolently condescended, to the conditions of mortality. In order to prove to doubters and to those who were to testify of his resurrection that it was indeed himself in bodily presence, he allowed his followers to convince themselves by tangible evidence, and he ate before them; but it does not follow that his frame was unchanged. The manner in which the story is related of his appearance after the doors were closed, seems to intimate that his approach was not in the usual manner; and the same may be said of his mode of quitting the disciples at Emmaus, when he had broken bread with them. The accounts of his various appearances, added to that of his ascension, suggest the belief that he rose from the short sleep of death invested with a "spiritual body," perceived by his followers to be more pure and glorious than that which sustained this change, and known to be immortal.

Thus far the case of all who die is probably the same as his. What there was peculiar in the case of Jesus was in consequence of the peculiarity of his office. It was the necessary conclusion of his mission that he should *prove* the resurrection by submitting himself to the gross senses of his followers; and therefore no mortal remains, as in other cases, were left behind, but he underwent that *change* of the gross into the etherealized body which Paul anticipated for those who, as he believed, would remain alive at the coming of Christ. It seems that this peculiarity was shared by Elijah, and perhaps by Moses; and it presents no difficulty whatever in the way of our determination how far the analogy holds between the mode of Christ's resurrection

and that of other men. The analogy holds as far as their circumstances are alike and no further. We are mortal, and designed for immortality; therefore we shall die and rise like him. Our mortal frame is of the same general structure as his; therefore it will undergo the same general process. We are *not* appointed to prove any ulterior fact through the proof of our identity after death, and therefore our gross remains will be left to decay, and we shall *not* come to survivors in a visible and tangible form.

We must resist our inclination to go into the consideration of the many Scripture facts related to those we have mentioned, and of the speculations on a local heaven, &c., &c., and pass on to the reasonings of the New Testament respecting the doctrine of a resurrection and future life, adverting to them only for the sake of illustrating the supposition now before us. The two principal parts are 1 Thess. iv. 13, to the end, v. 1—12, and 1 Cor. xv. In considering these passages, it is clear, first, that Paul expected an event which did not come to pass; viz. that before his generation passed away, the end of the mortal state of humanity should arrive; that the departed should come with Christ, that his living disciples should be taken, without dying, into a state of incorruptibility, and that the whole race should then have entered upon the future life promised by Christ. It is easy to account for this erroneous expectation of the Apostle by reviewing the prophecies of Christ respecting his kingdom and its close on the overthrow of the Jewish state—the end of the age, as it was emphatically called—and by remembering how different a thing it is to interpret a prophecy, however distinct, before its accomplishment, and to recognize its fulfilment after the event. Nothing is easier than to separate what relates to this false expectation from the philosophical reasonings on death and resurrection, which are in no way invalidated by it. It is clear, in the second place, that the whole chain of reasoning is worthless and unintelligible on the hypothesis of a separate soul, and that it gives no intimation whatever, as a whole, or in any separate part, of a simultaneous resurrection of mankind; while it is perfectly consistent with the last of our three suppositions.

Nothing is more natural than that Paul should describe the dead as those who *sleep*, because there is certainly no stronger analogy to the apprehensions of the living than that between death and sleep; an analogy which remains apparent to the survivors long after it has, according to our doctrine, ceased to the departed. It should be remembered how perpetually Paul at the same time represents the state of the departed as a state of consciousness, of activity, and enjoyment. It is, indeed, possible to interpret these representations as having a prospective meaning; but while such an interpretation is unnecessary, and while it destroys in a great measure the analogy between the case of Christ and that of men in general, we shall scarcely be inclined to adopt it. As for the rest, it can be necessary for our readers only to institute a comparison between our doctrine and the reasoning of Paul on death and revival, to admit their perfect consistency. We were about to go over the several points of his argument, the question whether Christ arose, the application of his case to all others, the contrast of the states under Adam and Christ, the reply to objectors on physical grounds, the triumphant anticipation of the final issue to humanity—but this our readers can do for themselves, almost at a glance, and be thereby more disposed than they could be by any suggestions of ours to wonder how the belief of a separate soul could ever have been held in conjunction with concurrence in the Apostle's argument; or how grounds of belief in a simul-

taneous resurrection of mankind could ever have been found in this portion of the sacred writings.

Having thus briefly explained what view of a very obscure subject appears to us most consistent with all the facts within our reach, (which view, however, we are quite ready to modify or relinquish as soon as fuller evidence shall shew us cause for doing so,) our judgment of Mr. Carmichael's book will be easily anticipated by those of our readers who are already acquainted with it—of as much of it, at least, as relates to the subject we have been considering.

Mr. C., being a Member of the Royal Irish Academy, took his turn to prepare a paper, as the custom is, to be read before the Society. The two first sections of the little work before us were prepared for this purpose so long ago as 1817. The remainder was written long afterwards, when the author had found reason to change his philosophical system very extensively, and to retract much which he had formerly advanced. From this singular method of putting a book together, it necessarily arises that there is much inconsistency in the volume, and a vacillation of opinion not a little perplexing to an unpractised inquirer, while no form could perhaps have been better chosen for shewing the true nature of the argument, and for pointing out the direction in which evidence preponderates; or for enabling the reader to judge, on the author's own involuntary shewing, of the progress of the mind of an inquirer, not only from truth to truth, but from strength to strength in the apprehension of truth. Towards the beginning of his book, Mr. C. says,

“The necessary attributes of Spirit, as distinguished from Matter, are the powers of sensation, perception, judgment, and will. Man is endowed with these powers; if they cannot reside in the material substance of which he is composed, they must inhere in an essence similar, however inferior, to the essence of God. There must, therefore, be such an essence, however inferior, in man. That essence is the soul,” &c.—P. 3.

Again,

“The philosopher who shall establish even probable grounds for the common opinion of the soul's immortality will be, of all men, the most deserving of the gratitude of his species.”—P. 20.

Which opinion, however, he, after an interval of years, believes he “may unhesitatingly retract,” having become a materialist, and an advocate for Lawrence on Physiology, and having learned by practice not to set out in an argument with begging the question. The result of the whole of this part of the work is, that the writer overthrows the ancient superstition (as we esteem it) of a separate soul, and not dreaming apparently of any other alternative, adopts with all its difficulties the doctrine of a simultaneous resurrection of the whole human race, excepting of course Christ, Elijah, and probably Moses, and possibly Enoch. As his object is to dwell on the Physical Considerations connected with his various topics, he plunges with his readers into the tossing sea of the ancient metaphysics, where, however some may have found their

“joy
Of youthful sports was on its breast to be
Borne, like its bubbles, onward,”

they have no right to draw others after them without a prospect of bringing

them safe and pleased to shore ; which prospect is not ours at present ; so that we shall content ourselves with sympathizing with our author in his evident enjoyment of these invigorating exercises, and with congratulating him on his general acuteness ; though his zeal leads him occasionally into temptations to injure the arguments of others by exaggeration, and his own by deficiency of method in his arrangement. We cannot approve, for instance, of the following method of stating the alternative between the flight of the soul at death and the resurrection of the body on the day of judgment :

"The question is, an immortal soul? or a resurrection from death? Let us inquire what would be our choice if that gracious Maker should say to us, 'Choose ye! an eternal state of being is assured to you. Will ye enter it at the moment when terminates your mortal career? And breaking away from a social world to which ye are linked by a thousand affectionate ties, will ye adventure, desolate and alone, into the infinitude of the universe, to seek, ye know not where, for the Elysium of your hopes, the dwelling-place of those who were dear to you upon earth? Or will ye rest awhile from your labours? Repose in the grave with those whom you loved—mingle your dust with theirs—dissolve away together into apparent nothingness; yet at the appointed time hear my *promised* summons, and start TOGETHER into renovated existence?' If such were the proposition, few would find a difficulty in making their election. What our gracious Creator, in his benignity, seems to have decided for us, is the distribution we should have anxiously chosen for ourselves."—P. 67.

Not, perhaps, if the alternative had been fairly put ; for the soul would not "adventure, desolate and alone," would not be ignorant where to seek, &c., if its separation from the body had been ordained by God. What would Mr. Carmichael think of the following statement of his adversary's argument?

"Choose ye!—an eternal state of being is promised to you. Will ye make that promise a mockery by falling into a state of virtual annihilation, from which ye shall not be restored for ages of ages; will ye choose corruption in its most loathsome form, and forego all which distinguished you from the clod of the valley, all which made God your God and his angels your brethren; or, if there be within you an indestructible germ of being, will ye commit that atom to the winds of heaven, or confound it with the sands of the desert, or plunge it in the deepest caverns of the ocean?—or will ye rather preserve without intermission the dignity of your conscious being, passing with incommunicable rapture from the chamber of mourning and the bed of disease to a region of life and love and glory, where blessed spirits are thronging around to greet you, and where, amidst all its newness and splendour, you shall at once recognize your home?"—If such were the proposition, few would find a difficulty in making their election," &c.

Is the one statement more fair than the other? The faults of arrangement by which the author's own argument suffers are inherent in the plan of the work, and are perplexing to his readers, who need every aid which method can give towards understanding the drift of the writer amidst his changes of opinion. One thing, however, is clear; that he vanquishes the immaterialists as far as he attempts it, and that if his own scheme is surrounded with difficulties nearly as great, he is ready to perceive and admit them.

In the section relating to the nature of superior beings, our author does not go over much of the ground turned up by the Angelic Doctor, though it may seem difficult on such a subject to avoid his traces. Here we have rather a speculation on what our own state and employments shall be here-

after, than an inquiry into the actual constitution of angels. This is very well; for in the first case we have a starting point of fact; in the last we have none. Till we have some better evidence of the existence of superior beings than our own presumptions, however strong, we cannot hope to learn much of their nature, and shall only lose time in doubting "whether objects involved in utter darkness are not visible to those beings; and whether their conversation is not audible to each other, even in a void." Does not our author perceive that in the license of conjecture he has in this instance allowed himself, the doubt itself rests on the assumption that angels have eyes, lungs, and ears?

On the eternally interesting topic of Providence, general or particular, our author writes in a way to perpetuate the interest and beauty of the theme: but is he sure that we must wait till we join the brotherhood of superior beings before we can solve its difficulties? Do they not arise from the assumption that Time is a condition of being to which Deity itself is subject? Our own intellectual progression here undoubtedly causes a gradual change in our relation to Time, and thereby enables us to obtain some notion of the mode in which we shall, when further improved, perceive a general and particular Providence to be the same thing. The difficulties of this subject appear to us to be so evidently soluble, that in a few generations they will probably be heard of no more. We speak not here of the designs of Providence, but merely of the perplexities attending the doctrinal division of Providence into general and particular.

Our author well exposes the absurdities which have arisen from the changes of meaning which the word *spirit* has undergone, from the ancient times when it signified etherealized matter as well as that which is not matter at all, to the present day, when the term is commonly used in close argument with more precision. He supposes that all beings—except the Supreme—who have been called spiritual are organized, and that it is therefore rational to speculate on the conditions of their existence, which he does with some acuteness and a great deal of eloquence. We have been doubting which of two passages to extract, a speculation on the powers of superior beings, or a defence of the inquiry on the ground that no truth can be dangerous. We conclude to give both:

"Is it inconsistent with reason to suppose that Omnipotence could bring into existence an ORGANIZED being, endowed with more numerous and excellent faculties than man, and framed of more pure and imperishable materials—that such a being, though privileged from the inspection of senses like ours, is open to the observation of such beings as himself—that his enjoyments must be great in proportion to his capacity for happiness; and his desire of knowledge commensurate with his powers to attain it—that the wonders of nature cannot be disregarded by *him*, if scrutinized with enthusiasm by subordinate creatures like us.—If *we* follow after truth till our limited faculties fail us, will *he* not maintain the pursuit to the verge of creation?—If such be *his* passion, will God deny him the power to indulge it?—To believe that in the wide extent of this universe, no creature exists with such passions and such powers, is almost to believe that this universe was created in vain—a menagerie indeed for rational creatures to fatten and breed in; but not the magnificent temple of God, worthy to be viewed from every aspect, examined in every detail, and studied in its beautiful and stupendous proportions.—Is it not rational then to presume that such creatures exist, animated with such propensities and endowed with such powerful means to accomplish their purposes? The speed of a comet may indeed fall short of their necessities; but they may be gifted with the velocity of light. But will that velocity suffice

them?—It will scarcely transport them from one fixed star to another, though the distance be no greater than from Sirius to the Sun, in a shorter period than six of our years—nor would it convey them to the most distant star of our own Galaxy in less than 3000.—But in travelling with the incessant speed of light to the most distant nebula, whose radiance has entered the telescope of Herschel, upwards of 30,000 years would scarcely determine their journey.—Even those superior beings could scarcely afford out of eternity, to a single purpose, so vast an expenditure of time.—Their swiftness must therefore be incomparably greater than the swiftness of light,—the greatest which has yet been submitted to human calculation. But still, however difficult it may be to conceive an impulse so great, to deny its existence were absurd and presumptuous, while it indicates no contradiction of nature or reason. In the manifold varieties of rational creatures which people the habitable spots of the universe, is it inconsistent with reason to presume that organized beings, so potent, so intelligent, so ardent after truth, so fitted to attain it, so capable of appreciating every species of happiness, so gifted with powers to ensure its acquisition, and so formed of imperishable materials to enjoy it for ever—is it inconsistent with reason to presume the existence of such beings; and if an essence, like spirit, such as it has been fabricated by metaphysical ingenuity, can scarcely be supposed to exist, is it not certain that creatures like these must fill a place in the gradations of nature?—They are not spirits because they are organized; but in all other points they are similar to that species of being, as conceived by most rational men, till the time of Des Cartes. Even the early Christians very generally entertained opinions almost identical, and regarded God as the only Mind which acts and thinks without material organs. If they had advanced a step farther, and believed Him to be the only Spirit that exists, they would have derogated nothing from his unparticipated nature in asserting that the noblest rank of beings whom he vouchsafed to create essentially differed from him in being simply and specifically organized creatures.”—Pp. 53—56.

Against the calculation of speed given above, we must make the objection before adverted to, that *time* is probably a very different thing to beings of a more enlarged comprehension than ours and to ourselves. So many other conditions of existence being supposed to be changed, why should this one be imagined stationary from the ephemeron to the Supreme himself? To our apprehension, no condition of being seems more liable to variation with varieties of state than this. But to our other extract:

“But what is this cant of dangerous truths?—Rude, slanderous, and lacerating truths, affecting the self-esteem of individuals and the peace of families, are unfortunately too common; but, dangerous truths, destructive to the well-being of society or the happiness of mankind, are a contradiction in terms—an impossible chimera. Truths may be mischievous and reprehensible in the schools of good-breeding and humanity, but in those of politics it were slavery—in those of physics it were barbarism—in those of morals it were profligacy—and in those of religion it were blasphemy to assert that there is or can be an existing absurdity so enormous as a dangerous truth. Dangerous falsehoods indeed there may be—but freedom of discussion is the true mode of detecting the fallacy and obviating the danger. The magnificent works of the Creator, whether inanimate, brute, or rational—the laws by which he governs them, whether physical, moral, or divine, demand and invite our researches; and is it within the range of possibility that in these sacred precincts we can light on a truth degrading to him, or pernicious to ourselves? Such truths are emphatically the truths of God; and whoever has the good fortune to discover and the guilt to suppress them, is at once ignorant of his duties to God and to man. Despicable as a coward, and odious as a hypocrite, he may lick the feet of authority and prejudice; but he knows not the way to contribute to the happiness of man by increasing his

knowledge, or to acquire the favour of God by studying his works and unfolding his wisdom."—P. 62.

These are the best possible convictions on which to proceed in inquiries of every kind. Our reader will have discovered that our author is eloquent, and will not therefore wonder at our giving the summing up of his various arguments in his words (with all their typographical emphasis) rather than our own :

"I conceive that in the progress of this work I have demonstrated, in opposition to prevailing notions, this incontrovertible TRUTH, that all real and absolutely existing beings must exist in space, and bear relations to space and time; and that I have established, as the MOST RATIONAL BELIEF we can entertain on the subject, that God is the only SPITIT in existence; and that angel and archangel, cherub and seraph, whatever the immortal essence of which they are compounded, are, like man, and all other living creatures with which we are acquainted, merely organized beings. That our hopes of a future state cannot rest with any certainty upon the existence of a soul, as maintained by the ancient philosophers, but upon our resurrection from death, as announced by Christ, and taught by the evangelists and apostles throughout the whole of the Christian revelation. And, lastly, though the kingdom of heaven, when restricted to the triumphant reign of moral and religious feelings upon earth, may properly be called a spiritual kingdom, yet that the promised heaven of hereafter is not an immaterial world of immaterial spirits, but a local and substantial portion of the universe, peopled by visible, tangible, active and sociable beings, the more pure, intelligent, permanent, resplendent, and powerful, in proportion as their organization and essence are refined, exalted and imperishable; and that, with the exception of God himself, who is A SPIRIT, and whose incommunicable essence no creature can participate, all living beings, in their gradations from the highest class to the lowest, bear a semblance or relation, either intimate or remote, to each other; that as planet resembles planet, and sun resembles sun, so universe resembles universe throughout the creation; and whether those universes roll round a void, or round some mighty orb in the centre of all, which may constitute the highest empyrean—the more immediate dwelling of God—the seat of his visible glories, still that NATURE, in all its varieties of worlds and beings, is, like its Creator, but ONE—exemplifying in all its complication of arrangements, however minute or stupendous, an unity of design, the simple, the uniform, the exquisite result of an infinite, all-gracious, omniscient, omnipotent MIND."—P. 95.

No part of this little work is more satisfactory than the section in which the scriptural evidence for and against a separate soul is collected and weighed. It is perfectly clear that the nature of this evidence has been widely mistaken, as much through an excessive attachment to our common translation of the Scriptures, as through ignorance of the Jewish superstitions. Change *spirit* into *breath*, *soul* into *life*, *hell* into *hades*, and *paradise* into a *garden of rest*, as often as they might fairly be so changed, and what becomes of the evidence for the doctrine so long and pertinaciously held as a part of Christianity? With one more extract, containing a suggestion, of whose value our readers will judge for themselves, we conclude :

"With this history of the word Paradise before us, we may reasonably doubt that the modern sense of the word had ever been applied to it in the time of our Saviour. The sense in which he used it in that singular and often-quoted text, Luke xxiii. 43, remains now to be investigated. 'And one of the malefactors which were hanged railed on him, saying, If thou be Christ, save thyself and us: but the other answering rebuked him—and said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom: and

Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' It has been suggested to me by a learned and intelligent friend, in whose clear views, unbiassed judgment, and enlightened understanding, I place unqualified confidence, that the meaning of this passage has been utterly mistaken; and that whatever was the penitence of the thief, there was no beatitude in the paradise promised by our Saviour. On the contrary, that his words were intended as a check to those hopes of a temporal kingdom so generally entertained by all his followers, and which, from the preternatural events that attended his crucifixion, appeared on the very verge of being realized—His revilers and persecutors exclaimed, 'If he be the *King of Israel*, let him now come down from the cross, and *we* will believe in him.' No wonder that those who already believed him, should also believe that the marvels they witnessed were but a prelude to his actual descent from the cross, and the establishment of his expected kingdom. No wonder the malefactor, who was a Jew, trained up in the expectation of a Messiah that was to emancipate Judea, and extend his dominion over the earth, should fall into the same self-deception—should rebuke his railing companion; and, confiding in the power of the king of Israel thus awfully manifested, not only to save himself and them, but to advance their *temporal* interests in a kingdom which was indeed to embrace mankind, but which had no concern save with *spiritual* and *eternal* interests, should, with more of self-love than repentance, exclaim, 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom;' and Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, instead of that temporal kingdom thou dost hope for, to-day thou shalt be, with me, among the dead."—Pp. 125—127.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTICES OF EMINENT CONTINENTAL UNITARIANS.

No. I.

It is a common, but extremely erroneous opinion, that Unitarianism is a religion of yesterday; that it cannot rank among the number of its adherents such eminent fathers as Athanasius and Augustine, or such distinguished reformers as Luther and Calvin; and that, instead of being adapted to the capacities of the poor, and of mankind at large, it rests for its support upon criticisms and refinements of the most specious but delusive kind; and like some of the ancient schemes of philosophy among the Greeks, is unintelligible to all but the initiated few. To those, however, who are properly informed on such subjects, it is well known that these charges owe their origin to a system of the grossest misrepresentation; that Unitarianism existed in the Christian church long before the doctrine of the Trinity was even thought of; that it constituted the belief of the mass of Christians till the beginning of the third century; that after this period, its doctrines were gradually corrupted; that from the time of the first Christian emperors, its professors were openly persecuted, and coerced by the strong arm of the civil power; that during what are usually called the dark ages, its glory was obscured by that cloud of ignorance and superstition in which every form of Christianity was then shrouded; and that when the light of the Reformation dawned, it burst forth with a splendour too brilliant, and a lustre too intense, for the benighted minds even of the Reformers themselves.

Not only did the ancient Unitarians invariably assert that theirs was the doctrine of the Christians of the primitive ages, but candid Trinitarians in modern times have acknowledged that, during the first three centuries of the

Christian era, the Son was considered to be inferior to the Father, and regarded as a created being. Among writers of this class we may rank the learned Ecclesiastical Historian, Mosheim ; Matthias Flacius Illyricus, one of the most able and zealous of the Lutheran Reformers ; M. Jurieu, an eminent Protestant divine, and rigorous defender of the orthodox faith ; and Dionysius Petavius, the celebrated Jesuit. Nor is this all ; for Justin Martyr, an eminent Christian father of the second century, speaking of Christ's Deity, expresses himself more like an humble apologist, introducing a new doctrine, than the advocate of a system which had been sanctioned and rendered venerable by time ; and Tertullian, who flourished a few years later than Justin, gives his direct testimony to the fact, that Unitarianism was the doctrine held by the mass of unlearned Christians of the Latin as well as the Greek church in his own age.

Nor let it be supposed that Unitarianism had no advocates in ancient times among the learned. Several are mentioned by ecclesiastical writers, whom the orthodox found it impossible, with all their threats, to silence, and who clung to the primitive doctrine concerning Christ amidst evil report as well as good report. Of these it may be deemed sufficient to mention the names of Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch ; Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra ; and Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium ; men who were equal in learning and in piety to any of their contemporaries, and of whom any denomination of Christians might be justly proud.

We pass over the dark ages as a barren desert, without fertility and without interest, and hasten on to the period of the Reformation, associated with which we find the names of men whose praises are loudly celebrated by Protestants of all classes. But why are we so seldom reminded of those eminent Reformers who embraced antitrinitarian sentiments, and were inferior to none of their contemporaries in learning or in virtue ? Why are the names and labours of these illustrious servants of God so studiously passed over, as if the very pen which recorded, or the very breath which uttered them, were loaded with contagion ? Far as we are from wishing to disparage such men as Luther or Calvin, and those of similar sentiments, who co-operated with them in the great work of reformation during the sixteenth century, we cannot help observing that they left their great undertaking only partially accomplished ; and we confess it has always appeared to us that no award was ever made with more judgment and impartiality than that which is conveyed in the following lines, said to have been inscribed upon the tomb of Faustus Socinus :

Tota licet Babylon, destruxit tecta Lutherus,
Muros Calvinus, sed fundamenta Socinus.

The revival of Unitarianism at the period of the Reformation, and the rapid progress which it made in Italy, Poland, Transylvania, and other countries, would form an interesting subject for the pen of the historian, in the prosecution of which a number of important facts might be brought to light that are as yet scarcely known to the great mass of English readers. A hasty sketch of this kind is prefixed to Dr. T. Rees's " Translation of the Racovian Catechism," and another to the late Dr. Toulmin's " Memoirs of the Life of F. Socinus." The Rev. Theoph. Lindsey has also collected many curious and interesting facts relating to this subject in his " Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship, from the Reformation to our own Times." But the inquiry has never been pursued to its full extent by any English writer ; and any person who would undertake it, and

embody in an English dress all which can be collected upon the subject, would deserve well of the religious public. As one step towards this great undertaking, we propose giving a series of biographical sketches of the more celebrated among the continental Unitarians.

Stutgard, the capital of Wirtemberg, had the honour of giving birth to the first Protestant who openly avowed antitrinitarian sentiments. The name of this father of modern Unitarianism was *Martin Cellarius*. He was born in the year 1499, and died in 1564. He studied philosophy at the University of Wittemberg, under Luther, and made great proficiency in those branches of science and literature which were commonly cultivated among the learned of that age. He was also distinguished, in after life, as an oriental scholar and a theologian. He first rose into eminence about the year 1520; and when Luther threw off the Papal yoke, Cellarius, who was honoured with the friendship and esteem of the great Reformer, was among the first of those who embraced his principles. But it soon became evident that he was not destined to be a servile follower of Luther, or any other merely human teacher. Having engaged in a controversy with Stubner and Storck, two of the most active leaders of the German Anabaptists, he was convinced by their arguments, and had the candour to acknowledge and retract his errors. Hornbeck informs us that it was while Cellarius was connected with this party that he first became an author; but, pursuing his religious inquiries with a freedom previously unknown in that age, he was led ultimately to embrace Unitarian sentiments, and became very zealous for their diffusion. The public profession, however, of these new opinions, which were equally obnoxious to Catholics and Protestants, exposed him to a succession of persecutions, and compelled him, in the year 1536, to fly for safety and protection into Switzerland, where he assumed the name of *Borrhaus*, and spent the remainder of his life in comparative tranquillity. The ministers of Sarmatia and Transylvania, speaking of Cellarius, say, "What has not Martin Cellarius attempted that he might clear the way for posterity?—Read his writings." In another place they observe, that "God gave to Luther and Zuinglius the honour of reforming the received doctrines concerning Justification and the Eucharist; but that it was Martin Cellarius, Servetus, and Erasmus, who were first employed by him as instruments in inculcating a knowledge of the true God, and of Christ." In a manuscript history of the life of Servetus, attributed by Allwoerden to Castalio, honourable mention is made of Cellarius, who is described as "chief professor of theology in the city of Geneva" at the time of Servetus's martyrdom, and is mentioned as the principal opponent of Calvin in that dark transaction. Faustus Socinus, in a letter to Peter Statorius, dated October 15, 1590, says that his uncle Lælius collected testimonies concerning Cellarius; and if this collection were still in existence it would probably throw great light upon the early history of the Protestant Reformation. Andrew Althamer, one of the Reformers who pushed his sentiments to the very verge of Antinomianism, charges Cellarius with holding the opinions of Paul of Samosata, and represents him as having taught that Jesus Christ was a human prophet. Whatever degree of truth there may be in this charge, it is certain that Cellarius lived and died a firm believer in the doctrine of the Divine Unity. Besides several philosophical essays, he wrote a treatise "on the Works of God," "Commentaries on Ecclesiastes, on the Five Books of Moses, on the Books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings, on Isaiah and the Apocalypse, and on the Book of Job," and published other theological works.

In connexion with Cellarius, the ministers of Sarmatia and Transylvania speak of *Alfonso Lingurius*, of Tarragona in Spain, and say, "What has not Alfonso of Tarragona attempted, who, in his 'Five Books on the One God, and his only Son,' has some excellent observations directed against the tyranny and pride of those Aristarchuses who teach the commonly-received doctrine?"

Wolfgang Fabricius Capito is also mentioned, by the ministers and elders of Transylvania, as the friend and fellow-labourer of Cellarius, in a book "On the Divinity of the Mediator, the man Christ Jesus."—"Fabricius Capito," say they, "a man who was remarkable alike for piety and erudition, after some preliminary observations on the superior mental endowments of his fellow-labourer Cellarius, and the excellent character of his book, (On the Works of God,) mentions certain religious topics on which he had some private conversation with Cellarius, such as the knowledge of the one God, and of Christ, and the Holy Spirit." To a portion of the above work of Cellarius, published in quarto at Weissenburg, A. D. 1568, a preliminary epistle, written by Capito, was prefixed, in which he thus expresses himself as to the imperfect nature and limited extent of the Reformation in which he and his fellow-labourers were then engaged: "This book of Cellarius concerning the Works of God, however excellent, and Bucer's 'Matthew,' which cautiously teaches many things above the capacity of the vulgar, as well as our own 'Hosea, Malachi and Isaiah,' in which, according to the best of our ability, we have treated upon matters relating to God and truth in a manner not altogether different from the style of Cellarius; all these things of ours, I say, will decay and perish, with us their authors, like all other human things, in spite of ourselves. This we know, and write accordingly, but only for present use, till God shall reveal greater things." Capito was brought up to the study of physic, in which profession he graduated; but after the death of his father, about the year 1504, he began to devote his attention to law and theology. The latter of these he finally made choice of as his profession. He first became a preacher at Spire, from which place he was invited to Basil. The Archbishop of Mentz, having heard of his great merit, appointed him his chancellor in 1520. This office he accepted, with the view of enlisting the chief of the German clergy into the service of the Reformation, and bringing about the contemplated change without disturbance; and as long as he entertained any hope of success in this laudable design, he prevailed with Luther not to exasperate the heads of the church by his vehemence, who might perhaps be gained over by gentler means. But when he saw that interest and ambition prevailed with the archbishop, he renounced the office to which he had been appointed, and quitting the court, retired to Strasburg, where he exercised, during the remainder of his life, the humble functions of a pastor. He fell a victim to the plague in the year 1541 or 1542. He is represented by contemporary writers as a learned and eloquent divine, and is said particularly to have excelled as a Hebrew scholar. His principal works were "Hebrew Institutions, in two Books," "Commentaries on some of the Prophets," and "A Life of Ecolampadius," besides which he published some remarks on the subject of Marriage, and on the Power of the Civil Magistrate in Affairs of Religion. Sandius assigns to him the first place in his Catalogue of Antitrinitarian Writers.

In the year 1527, Lewis Hetzer and John Denk, two of the earliest among the continental Unitarians, published a joint translation of the prophetic books of the Old Testament into German. Denk was a native of Nurem-

berg, and ranked deservedly high among the Protestants of his day. He believed that God is the fountain of all created existences, and that the Spirit or Power of God ranks next to God in the scale of being; and after *the Spirit* he placed *the Word*, which he believed to be begotten of God by the Spirit. This doctrine bears a strong resemblance to that of Irenæus, and the other Greek fathers of the second century. Hetzer carried his views much further than Denk, maintaining that the Father alone is the true God; that Christ is not equal to God the Father, but vastly inferior to him, and of a different essence; that there are not three persons in one God, for that God is altogether ineffable, being neither person nor essence. His opinions on this subject are said to be embodied in the following verses, of which he is himself reputed to have been the author :

Ipsè ego, qui propriâ cuncta hæc virtute creabam.
 Queris quot simus ? Frustra : ego solus eram.
 Hic non tres numero, verum sum solus, at isti
 Haud numero tres sunt, nam qui ego, solus eram.
 Nescio personam, solus sum rivus ego, et fons ;
 Qui me nescit, eum nescio : solus ero.

Hetzer was a native of Bavaria, a man of great learning, and deeply versed in the original languages of the Scriptures. He is said, like Cellarius, to have joined the Anabaptist party in the first instance, and to have been upon terms of great intimacy with Storck and Muntzer ; but differing from them on some points, and particularly as regarded their levelling principles, he seceded from them, and retired to Zurich, in 1523. In the year following he openly impugned the doctrine of the Trinity ; but the freedom of his opinions being at variance with the narrow and bigoted spirit of the age, he was thrown into prison, and ultimately condemned to death, by the magistrates of Constance, on a charge of blasphemy. This cruel sentence was carried into execution in the month of February, 1529. Historians, however, are not agreed as to the nature of his punishment, Sandius and others affirming that he was beheaded, whereas Seckendorff informs us that he was burnt at the stake. Plauter says of him, " that he very honestly and unblameably bade farewell to his disciples, and with most devout prayers commended himself to God, even to the astonishment of the beholders." Some writers have asserted that he was a man of licentious principles and conduct ; but this view of his character, though adopted by Mosheim, appears to be entitled to little credit. The probability is that this charge was a fabrication of his enemies ; the most excellent characters, in those days, being exposed to the grossest misrepresentations, if they happened to hold opinions at variance with the orthodox creed.

A TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE REV JOHN HINCKS.

Who has not known some bright, calm, summer day,
 When thoughts all teem'd with bliss—all deeds with love ?
 When no dark cloud obscur'd the solar ray,
 When all below appear'd like all above ?

Such was thy course serene, "O Man of God!"
No passion-storm o'ercast thy peaceful mind;
'Twas breath celestial fann'd the sacred sod,
Whence rose the flower, to bloom in heaven design'd.

That heaven 'twas thine to paint;—'twas in thy breast:
The life that leads to heaven, thyself didst lead;—
So gently lead, 'twas all but heaven's own rest;
All but heaven's spirit, in each virtuous deed.

The scarce felt motion of a dying breeze,
The scarce seen ripple of a dying wave,—
These are the emblems musing Fancy sees,
When youth thus gently passes to the grave.

As colour'd crystal, sun-lit, spreads its hue
On cluster'd flowers, while each retains its own,
So, on thy soul while heaven its radiance threw,
Each virtue in its varied beauty shone.

The words of wisdom from the lips of youth,
'Twas thine to speak in all their soothing power;
On God's own word to found religious truth,
And teach its comfort in life's final hour.

That dark, mysterious hour 'twas thine to meet,
When earthly bliss was in its noontide glow;
When toil is pleasure, and when pain is sweet,
Endur'd for those most deeply lov'd below.

Tho' soon remov'd, thou hast not liv'd in vain;
Thy hours, tho' few, were bright;—a spring-tide day,
Not darken'd o'er by sorrow, or by pain,
With scarce a shower-drop, ere it pass'd away.

Thy lot it was to fill an early grave;
Thine and thy flock's best hopes and aims to leave:
How wept by those thy tears were shed to save!
How many doth thy God, thro' thee, bereave!

How sweetly did thy melancholy voice,
(To music's ear "prophetic of its end,")
Call on the Christian mourner to rejoice
That clouds, when breaking, ever heaven-ward tend!

As went thy tranquil life, so came thy death:
Silent the waveless stream to ocean pass'd.
Smiling, He took, who gave thy vital breath,
And bade thy first death-conflict be thy last.

Thy Saviour's faint, yet faithful image thou!
Thy modest claims his tongue one day shall tell;
For what *his* was, thy heaven-train'd soul is now;
And where *HE* is, thou shalt for ever dwell.

W. L.

Liverpool, February 11.

SABBATH MUSINGS.

No. II.

WE speak of the changes of nature, but what are they compared with the mutations in the spirit of man? On such a day as this we come to such a place as this, and, while treading on the decayed leaves of a former year, we point to the bursting buds around us, and say, "How many seasons are there in the life of one man!" But is there not a voice in this solitude which tells a different tale? Is there not here a character of stability which there is nothing in mortal life to rival? If these trees could whisper as they wave the history of all that has passed beneath them, would they not speak of creation, change, and progression, such as human experience knows not of? This aisle of columnar trees,—how long is it since they arose side by side, and interwove their topmost boughs, making a sanctuary where twilight may flee to rest at noon-day? How long is it since the ivy matted the ground, and climbed these living pillars, and hung its garlands to the breezes on high? Perhaps the cowed devotee retired hither to pay his debt of devotion, to transfer his prayers from his girdle into the care of his saint. Perhaps, as he stood beneath this shelter, some wandering breeze came to sweep aside the foliage, and give him a glimpse of the wide champaign studded with hamlets, speckled with flocks and herds, and overspread with the works of man's busy hands. Perhaps he crossed himself, and thanked heaven that he was not like these busy men, destined "to fret and labour on the plain below," but rather withdrawn into the stillness of retreat, where the songs with which the reaper cheers his toil could never come to disturb the orisons of the devout. Perhaps the Puritan has stood on this spot, trampling the snow-drop under foot, while looking up to the waving tracery, lamenting its likeness to the cathedral aisle, and wishing for power to uncover the verdant roof, and let in dust and glare. Here, while mourning over the unconverted, he perhaps turned away from the scent of violets, and would fain have hushed the cooings of the wood-pigeon. Since those days a better homage than that of the devotee and the fanatic has doubtless been offered; there may have been a progression from the idol worship of ignorance to that devotion under whose influence truth springs from the earth among the flowers, joy comes in the flickering lights, and praise is uttered in all the stirring harmonies around. Thus while, from season to season, Beauty has passed through this grove and vanished, Wisdom may have made it her abode, and may now be ready to whisper her experience from the days of her weak childhood to this time of comparative maturity.

Nor has she less to tell of the progression of an individual spirit than of that of generations; and her record of such a progression has she confided to these silent witnesses around me. To me there was ever a sabbath in this place: ever something awful in the invariableness of its character. It seems, therefore, with my Sabbath thoughts and feelings alone. In the winters of my childhood I loved to come when the neighbouring mansion was deserted, and the trackless snow shewed the solitude to be complete; and to this alley I first bent my steps, stopping only to gather the single rosebud drooping under its little burden of snow. When the scarce disclosed entrance between the laurels was reached, when I opened my rustling way, how darkly green was the covert, carpeted and tapestried with ivy as now! None crossed my path but the startled hare; nor did the momentary alarm reveal to me what I have since learned, that the hour was to me a

Sabbath, and the place a temple. In summer days the homage was of a different kind. I came for rest from the tumult of emotions raised by the voice of the preacher. When that voice spoke things that I could understand, it was like the voice of a growing waterfall, waxing stronger till the spirit could bear no more; till the young hearer looked up to the dome to see if angels were looking in, or to watch for signs that the judgment-day was come. After such an hour, welcome was the coolness which fell on me when I nestled here from the burning sun, and found all unchanged as in the wintry day: all within green and shining, whether I looked abroad on an expanse of snow, or on the sultry haze of an August noon. Welcome was rest after exhaustion; welcome were the old thoughts which came to blend with those which throbbed like keen sensations. Welcome hath been the blended influence of old and new thoughts from that day to this, when I can rejoice in the present through a clear interpretation of the past.

O how merciful is the injunction to man to pray! If there were no such injunction, who would not eagerly snatch the permission? What spirit is there that never needs rest, or can be happy without a home? And where is there a rest, where a home, but in communion—private communion—with the Father of the spirit? In sleep there is a rest for the body; in incessant change of objects there is refreshment for the intellect; but for the spirit there is or ought to be no sleep, and endless vicissitude brings weariness; and of the many refreshments which are perpetually administered by Providence, none are wholly and permanently satisfying but intercourse with itself. The natural influences of grief are strengthening and cheering when the clouds are overblown; the effects of sudden joy are often salutary as sweet; the exercise and growth of a healthful intellect affords delights which can be understood only by sympathy; and human love can fully satisfy all but an immortal spirit, can satisfy even an immortal spirit often and long together—but all these are not enough. Grief and joy come seldom and soon pass away; the intellect sickens at times; and as for human friendship, what two minds ever were as one in their progress, their experience, their earthly destiny, their heavenly capabilities? What spirit, however purely and firmly wedded to another, has not in its bitterness sighed, "I am alone!" or in more peaceful moments breathed, "Father, there is none but thou!" Where has not absence, estrangement, or death, sooner or later, worn or snapped the bond, and left the spirit unsupported? This failure of early sympathy is a necessary consequence of that spiritual advancement which, though it confers a more than counterbalancing bliss in the formation of nobler attachments, yet cannot stay the tears which hallow the remains of buried friendships; and if, in some rare instances, minds advance together, it can only be for awhile—only till the messenger, whom they know to be on the wing, appears to bear one away. In all earthly changes there is life, there is hope, there is joy; but there is no rest—and the spirit must have rest. Of even this place I should grow weary if its mutable elements were all—if the springing and fading flowers, the moving clouds, the ivy-clad trunks which bear within the seeds of decay, were all—if there were no eternal presence pervading and vivifying all, and uniting the many parts into one whole; and in the same manner would the elements of human experience be received at times with disgust if the same eternal presence were not there to sanctify their influences.

There are some who feel this perpetual presence a restraint; or rather, who, when they remember it, imagine that a perpetual consciousness of it would be a restraint. I wonder such do not feel the atmosphere stifling,

the light of day oppressive, and the motion of the life-blood a perpetual curse. Such surely imagine that the Divine presence is alike to all, uncongenial to all. They know not that it is tender to the weak as the downy pillow to the wearied head; animating to the strong, bright to the eagle-eyed, and most awful to the high-minded, to whom the awe of purity is bliss. They know not that when a burst of song comes from young lips, as the sun breaks through the clouds, it is an acknowledgment of the presence of God. They know not that when the hands of the sleeper are folded on his breast, it is a sign that he closed his eyes amidst a blissful sense of security. They mark not on the brow of the thoughtful, in the eye of the pure, in the erect port of the free of soul, the testimony that because God is within them these are what they are. Those who fear and dislike this perpetual presence, ever conceive of God as apart though present. They compare his stability, his ultimate purity, with man's change and progressiveness. But, one and immutable as God surely is in himself, to the experience of man Deity is progressive; and hence it is that the home of the human spirit is in God. The spirits of men are progressive at different rates, so as to preclude permanent companionship or lasting dependence: but the revelation of Deity is so unintermitting, so exactly apportioned to the discernment of the worshiper, so perfectly congenial to his wants, desires, and hopes, that the repose of dependence may be as entire as the freedom of action which such congeniality inspires. Therefore is it that communion with God becomes more precious as life advances, that devotion changes its character perpetually, while the attributes of its Object are unchangeable. Therefore is it that the aspirations of piety arise in individual minds through every region, from the low desires and fears of the infant, to praise akin to that which ascended from the hills of Galilee.

The devotion which the spirit prompts in Sabbath hours, in the sanctuary of nature, may surely be taken as the highest of which that spirit is capable; and what now seems to me that highest? It is not petition, I know not what to ask, because I know not the designs of my Father towards myself or others. I have prayed for blessings of every kind for myself and my brethren in the course of my life, and on looking back it seems to me now that there was presumption in such petitions. It will not always appear so; and when the impulse comes again I will again yield to it, because the desires of my spirit, from the highest to the lowest, shall ever be poured out to him; but now, I have all things; I feel that I shall have all things, and that all men are and shall be blessed to the utmost of their present capacities for blessedness. How full of bliss is life and the world! That child searching for violets on the teeming bank too busily to observe me—her brother astride on the bough of that breezy tree looking down into the nest he longs to take—the throng parting from yon distant church-door over the dewy meadows—I myself, half dazzled by these twinkling leaves, my spirit flowing like the brimmings of a mossy well—how happy are we all! I cannot form a wish for myself or them. Gratitude, deep, boundless gratitude, swallows up all desires; and the only due expression of this gratitude, the only means of tempering its fervid glow, is a joyful and entire surrender of them and myself to Him who smiles upon our joy. Truly we know not what to pray for as we ought. How low are all temporal desires to us, standing at this moment manifestly in the midst of eternity, when time is a mere abstraction of the reason, and actual existence is all with which the heart has to do! Of spiritual conditions, the apparent evil of some, and the ultimate design of all, we know yet less than of tem-

poral. We only know that all is good. "*Let us be,*" is therefore the only petition I can now offer. I know too little of the conditions of being to venture to prescribe them even to my own wishes. In this unconditional surrender merges that impulse of devotion in which a true and indispensable relief is found in some states of the spirit, but which must at some time die away. Confession of sin is the most gracious liberty which many a mourner can exercise. What ease to the oppressed, what a dawn to the benighted, is given,—what a fair and verdant way out of the tangled wilderness is opened by the condescension which invites man to confide his spiritual as well as temporal griefs to Him who alone can understand them! There is in some dark hours, in the dark hours of many years of every one's life, no other refuge from despair or from insensibility, no other support to struggles which with this support need never be impotent, no other way to outgrow the necessity which this permission is given to supply. But this necessity must be outgrown. If there are hours even now when we can make an unconditional surrender of our temporal lot, may there not be moments when we can exercise a similar trust respecting our spiritual state? Why not taste the perfect peace of a joyful acquiescence as to both? Why make it a sin to complain of the evils of the one, and a virtue to complain of the evils of the other? These evils, while evils, we cannot but feel; we ought not to cease to struggle against; but now—I might as well shudder at this low black cloud that comes hurrying towards me, as mourn over any other condition of my being.

While all here is still, as if the breezes had forgotten their accustomed haunt, how that single elm on the lawn shivers and stoops, as if an invisible giant were uprooting it for a trophy! The gust is coming, lighting here and there on the tree-tops, and rolling blackness and tempest before it. Far off the commotion begins. How the roar swells as it approaches, rushing, driving athwart the ivied stems, and whistling among the tossing boughs above! The terrified birds come fluttering each from its domestic tree. How that boy's light laugh mingles with the uproar as he rocks fearlessly in his lofty seat! He feels not more than I that these are tokens of wrath around us, or that these heavy drops are signs of Nature's sorrow. Human joy overflows in tears; and why should not the oppression of her solemn joy be removed in like manner? What a brimming shower! and the sun already gleaming again on the thousand tricklings from the shining leaves which refuse to retain their liquid burden! The whole grove glitters as if beneath the spray of Niagara. In a moment the chill is gone, and but for the pearls which gem those pendant crowns, the gust and the shower might be supposed the dream of a spring noon, the creation of preceding thoughts.

Thus may end, thus will end, the storms of the spirit; and in bright and harmonious praise, like that which greets my senses now, shall man bear his part when the vicissitudes of his early day are passed. Praise, praise alone shall be the end, as it ought to be the beginning, of devotion, though praise must change and advance its character as the mind of the worshiper advances. The infant's first communion should be praise. He knows or ought to know no fear; he knows or ought to know no want: for what then should he petition? When he learns that others have wants, he begins to petition for them, and in time for himself. When he becomes a subject of conscience, he is led to confession and to intercession. All this time praise should be the beginning and end of his communion: praise, first for the low good of which alone he is sensible; then for each new glimpse of glory which his

opening vision reveals, till his thanksgivings reach the ends of the earth and compass the starry heavens. Of the more sacred heights and depths which teem with realities instead of shadows, he knows not yet, nor has learned to praise creative and preserving power as manifested in the external creation for its true grandeur and ulterior purposes. Of the spiritual creation he knows nothing till long after he has been accustomed to adore the Maker of unnumbered worlds. When the rich mysteries of the sublimer creation become dimly discerned, he petitions less fervently for external good. As they wax clearer, his fears perish, his desires subside, his hopes pass through perpetual mutations till they become incorruptible, and his praise is of a kindred nature, however far inferior to that of the unseen world. He thenceforth regards the moving heavens only as they send their melodies through the soul; the forms of the earth only as they are instinct with life; and, no longer calling inanimate forms to witness his praises, he appeals from the infant on his bosom to the archangel who suspends new systems in the furthest void for sympathy in his adoration of the Father of his spirit.—Of higher subjects of praise man knows not, nor can conceive. It is bliss enough to discern the end of human worship, (in kind, if not in degree,) and in some rare moments, in occasional glimpses of a celestial Sabbath, to reach it.

O that our earthly Sabbaths could bear something of this character! But as long as so many ranks of mind join in its services, those services must be too high for some and too low for others. Blessed is the season to multitudes, and holy its rites to innumerable worshipers. But its benefits are of a specific kind; its devotion is peculiar, and can in no degree supply the place of private communion. Alas, then, for those who join not in its rites; and alas also for those who look not beyond its rites! Strange, that any should turn away coldly from the divinely-kindled altar, where multitudes are thronging to cast in their incense, and returning with the reflection of its glory in their faces! Yet more strange that any should avoid the still solitude where the fount of this glory wellet up for ever!

Surely there shall be solitary communion hereafter as there is on earth, a peculiar devotion of the inmost spirit to which there can be no requisites of outward circumstances. Here, while good men communicate by heart and hand, while the pure bring to the light the movements of the spirit, there is a tacit reserve, there are workings which are known by each to exist in the other, but which are testified by no sign, and could be revealed by no such testimony. Hereafter, though that which is now an intermitting refreshment shall be then the prime element of being, there will surely be, amidst the most perfect congeniality, the most entire sympathy in a common joy, a silent recognition in each of a treasure of incommunicable peace.

DR. J. P. SMITH'S SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE MESSIAH.

(Continued from p. 168.)

Section xviii. Isa. vi. 1—5. This passage relates a vision of Isaiah, by means of which he was commissioned to the prophetic office, and which consisted in a visible manifestation of the Divine presence, so that he said (ver. 5), "Mine eyes have seen the King, Jehovah of hosts." In John xii. 41, after quoting two passages from Isaiah, the last of them, respecting the obstinacy of the Jews in rejecting Christ, taken from this chapter, the Apostle writes, "These things said Isaiah when he saw his glory and spake of him," the person spoken of being apparently Christ, whence it has been concluded that Christ was Jehovah. The argument is generally employed by the defenders of the deity of Christ, and has been variously replied to by different Unitarian writers. The truth is, that if we believe on other grounds in the identity of Christ with Jehovah, this passage will appear to us to confirm that opinion, but a reference of this kind, which might so naturally and easily have been made without intending to teach such a doctrine, will never convince any one who finds that doctrine repugnant to the general tenor of Scripture. Dr. S. speaks severely of the Unitarian interpretations, as "invented in order to serve a system," "evasive, arbitrary, incongruous, and inadequate to the intention." The first charge means that a full conviction, arising from the careful study of other parts of Scripture, that Christ and Jehovah were distinct beings, disposed the minds of Unitarian commentators to seek and accept a sense of the words, not implying their identity: which may be true, but is far from being a reproach to them, or an objection to the interpretation. The other charges are no more than unsupported assertions expressing the *feeling* of a writer on one side of the question. We quote an expression of feeling on the other side, from the note on Isa. vi., of the learned and excellent Michael Dodson. He gives the words of Bishops Lowth and Pearce, affirming Christ to be called Jehovah, and goes on thus:

"How absurd! Is Christ, who suffered death on the cross, the king JEHOVAH, God of hosts? Did the seraphims address themselves to him when they cried, saying,

Holy, holy, holy JEHOVAH, God of hosts!
The whole earth is full of his glory!

"It is wonderful, indeed, that such learned and good men should have satisfied themselves in shutting their eyes against the clearest light; and in thus offering to the world an interpretation which they must have known to be liable to great objections. How easy and natural is the interpretation of John vii. 41, given by Dr. Clarke, in his 'Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity'!"

He then gives the passage from Clarke, whom Unitarians in general follow:

"The true meaning is; when Esaias saw the glory of God the Father revealing to him the coming of Christ, he then saw the glory of him who was to come in the glory his Father (Matt. xvi. 27). Esaias, in beholding the glory of God, and in receiving from him a revelation of the coming of Christ, saw, (i. e. foresaw) the glory of Christ, just as Abraham saw (that is, foresaw) his day, and was glad."—Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, No. 597.

The reader will find some valuable observations in Dr. Carpenter's Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel, third edition, p. 133. It is highly probable that the words, "these things said Isaiah," refer to the passage quoted from Isa. liii. The dogmatism of Dr. Smith admits of no reply. The impartial inquirer will probably consider this as one of those passages, the just interpretation of which must be determined by our convictions as to the general tenor of Scripture, and which is too ambiguous to be safely appealed to as a *proof* of any doctrine respecting our Lord's person.

On Dr. S.'s sixth section (Isaiah vii. 14) we need make no remark, as he himself maintains, that, most probably, the original Hebrew word does not necessarily denote virginity, but might be applied to a young woman lately married; "that the definitive appellation, 'the Virgin,' was at the moment applied to a known individual, who, at the proper time afterwards, became the mother of a distinguished child;" and that the name Emanuel is a "*commemorative and descriptive* title. It does not appear to have been intended as a proper name." "In what I suppose," he says, "to have been the primary and inferior reference, it would express no more than that, in the existing distresses of Judea and Jerusalem, God would be **WITH THEM** as their Almighty protector."

In this sense, no doubt, whether originally prophetic of him or not, it is applicable to the Messiah, and therefore, in denying any inference from it as to the divinity of his person, we are justified by Dr. S. himself.

The argument in the xxth section (on Isa. viii. 13, 14) is most extraordinary:

"The evident design of this passage is to point out the True and Eternal God as the author of safety and deliverance from imminent danger; that it is the duty of men to honour him and rely upon him in this capacity; and that those who refuse to do so will be the objects of his awful displeasure, involved by their own unbelief and disobedience in the more terrible ruin. The middle clauses are introduced by the Apostles Peter and Paul, (Rom. ix. 33, 1 Pet. ii. 8,) with an explicit application to Christ. There is also a conformity of sentiment well worthy of being observed, with other declarations of the New Testament, on the opposite effects of obedient dependence on Jesus as the only Saviour and rejection of him."—Vide Luke ii. 34; 1 Cor. i. 23.

Hence Dr. S. infers that Christ must have been the Jehovah who was to be the object of confidence and reverence to his people.

Isa. viii. 13, as he renders the words,

"To Jehovah of hosts himself, pay holy homage,
Even him your fear, and him your dread."

The fact is, that the passage in Rom. ix. 33, is a mixed quotation, and merely in the way of accommodation, from this place and Isa. xxviii. 16; the form and chief substance being taken from the latter, but the expression "stumbling-stone and rock of offence" derived from this. 1 Pet. ii. 6 is a quotation of Isa. xxviii. 16, and vers. 7 and 8 contain an imperfect quotation of the words in this place mixed with Psal. cxviii. 22, and evidently only accommodated. The other passages referred to merely contain similar figurative language, which may have been suggested by what is here said, but will not afford the slightest ground for supposing that the subjects must be the same. In Isa. xxviii. 16, to which alone there is the appearance of appealing as an authority in the texts referred to, it is Jehovah who *lays the stone*, and consequently the person so designated must be distinct from, and inferior to, him.

We now come to a very important passage generally quoted by writers in defence of the deity of Christ, and upon which the advocates of Unitarianism have also frequently expressed their views, so that we may confine ourselves to a few remarks on our author's mode of treating it. Section xxi. Isa. ix. 5, 6 :

"For a child is born to us :
A son is given to us :
And the sovereignty is upon his shoulder ;
And his name is called Wonderful, Counsellor,
God the mighty, Everlasting, Prince of peace :
To the extent of [his] sovereignty and to [his] peace [shall be] no end,
Upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom,
To fix it and to establish it, in judgment and in righteousness
From henceforth and for ever."

The important points are the epithets "God the mighty" and "Everlasting." Now we observe, that though Rosenmüller *interprets* the word as meaning GOD, he gives, even in his second edition, *fortis* as the proper sense of אֱל, (which seems to have been the way it was understood by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion,) noting also that the term is applied to Nebuchadnezzar (Ezek. xxxi. 11) ; and Gesenius, as well as Bauer, translates אֱל-גִבּוֹר "strong hero," for which Dr. S. acknowledges that he has given a *weighty reason*, though *he* thinks it is *outweighed* by another consideration. But even not to press the argument from the use of the very same words in the plural אֱלֵי גִבּוֹרִים for *mighty heroes* (Ezek. xxxii. 21), and admitting that the form אֱל, when not used collectively, was appropriated to express deity, yet as its primitive meaning is the *mighty one* or the *ruler*, and it is not a peculiar name of the true and only God, there would be nothing at all surprising in its being used in poetry as an epithet of a mighty prince, whose power and greatness the writer was prophetically celebrating. Rosenmüller gives the following extract from the letter of a Persian king of a later age : "Chosroes, king of kings, sovereign of potentates, lord of the nations, *prince of peace*, saviour of men, in the estimation of gods a man, good, *eternal* ; in the estimation of men a *god*, most illustrious, most glorious ; conqueror rising with the sun, and lending his eyes to the night." We may here make allowance, in the spirit of Rosenmüller's caution, for some progress of the fashion of employing such appellations, and yet find enough to justify our interpreting all the titles in the text under consideration as fit to be applied to a royal and distinguished personage, without any reference to a nature different from that of other men, and this without altering the present Hebrew text or the generally-received construction of the words.

Where Dr. S. has the epithet "Everlasting," there are in the Hebrew two words which may be literally rendered "father of the age to come," as they are by the LXX. He maintains, indeed, that עַד signifies "*eternity* ;" but this he cannot establish by any good evidence.

"Enjedin," says our author, speaking of the manner in which different interpreters have treated this text, "*observes deep silence on this whole passage.*" Truly he does so : to him Dr. S. might without any want of candour have attributed in this instance "the silence of *death*," (Scrip. Test. p. 185, second edit. and our remarks on that place,) as it is well known that his work (which is posthumous) only wanted for its completion notes on the Prophets, when death interrupted his labours. Dr. S. might have perceived that not this text in particular, but all the prophetic books are passed by in

his notes, or he might have read in the dedication, "*Imperfectum quidem opus. Quoniam absolutâ locorum Novi Testamenti, ex quibus Trinitatis dogma extruitur explicatione, cum Vetus Testamentum aggressus eo usque processisset, ut solummodo prophetæ restarent, in medio opere ceu servus fidelis et vigilans, a Deo ad lætiora est advocatus, et antequam cursum absolvisset bravo donatus;*"* but he wished it to appear that Enjedin was unable by any contrivance to evade the force of the passage, and he did not seek far for any other way of explaining his silence.†

Section xxiii. Isaiah xl. 1—3, 9—11. What God, the Lord Jehovah, is said to do in this passage is attributed by our author to Christ, because what is said of *preparing a way for JEHOVAH*, is in the New Testament applied to John, the forerunner of our Lord. Matt. iii. 3; John i. 23; Luke i. 76, 16:

"To rebut this conclusion," (viz. that the Messiah is the Lord Jehovah,) says Dr. S., "it is asserted that 'John was the forerunner of the Lord their God, by being the forerunner of Jesus, the great messenger of God to mankind.' It must be confessed that this interpretation is not destitute of apparent reasons, but after weighing the arguments on each side, I acknowledge that the evidence in favour of the other interpretation seems to me to preponderate."

It would seem, then, that in this instance Dr. S. does not consider his own case *very* strong, and as he acknowledges that the prophecy in its primary sense predicted "the deliverance of the sons of Judah from their mournful slavery in Chaldæa," consequently that it was, so far as concerned that primary sense, "fulfilled in a series of providential occurrences, without any thing properly miraculous," it is truly extraordinary that he should not consider the manifestations of Divine power and goodness in the miracles and doctrines of Christ as a sufficient accomplishment, without looking for any reference to his person. The attempt to argue from our Lord's application to himself of the same image of the *good Shepherd*, which the prophet employs to represent the care of Jehovah for his chosen people, is strange, and can hardly need refutation.

"Moses and David in the sacred writings," says our author, "and other chieftains in the oldest records of Gentile language and manners, are called the *shepherds* of their people. But it is to the *distinguishing* and exalted manner in which this appellation and its attributes are given to Christ, that the attention of the serious reader is invited."

Our Lord applies the image somewhat particularly, beautifully representing it by means of his dying for the good of mankind, and hinting at the call of the Gentiles, ("other sheep I have, which are not of this fold, them also I must bring,") as well as indicating the grand doctrine which he came

* "An *imperfect* work indeed. For, when, having completed the explanation of those passages of the New Testament from which the doctrine of the Trinity is derived, he had applied himself to the Old Testament, and had proceeded so far that only the *prophets* remained, in the midst of his labours, being found like a faithful and watchful servant, he was called away by God to a happier state, and before he had finished the course, received the prize of victory."—Enjedin, *Explicationes locorum, Epistola dedicatoria*.

† With respect to the primary or, perhaps, entire reference of the passage to Hezekiah, the admission of which would put an end at once to any argument from it respecting the nature of Christ, we would refer to the papers by the Rev. Robert Wallace, of Chesterfield, in the *Monthly Repository*, (Old Series,) Vol. XIX. for 1824. This gentleman maintains, with much force of argument, that the prophecy was fulfilled in Hezekiah.

to reveal in the words, "I give unto them eternal life." But Cyrus and the Jewish princes and rulers, as well as Moses and David, are compared to shepherds in the Old Testament, and the case of the bad as well as of the good shepherd is minutely applied, nor could any image be more natural. Any thing *distinguishing* and *exalted* in the manner in which the appellation is given to Christ, either belongs of necessity to the character of his mission or exists only in our author's fancy. His own note, where he suggests as a possible objection, "that our Lord follows up this style of sovereignty with expressions of subordination and dependency," is a sufficient answer to him; for the remark respecting *official* subordination united with the possession of "*Divine* dignity and power," if it were not a mere quibble, would at least be in its application to the present purpose a gross *petitio principii*. What might we not prove if the use of the same image in two instances were to be taken as a sign of the identity of the subjects!

Section xxv. Isa. xlv. 21—25. The pretence for supposing this passage to relate to Christ, and hence that he is called *Jehovah, God, the Righteous, the Saviour*, is thus stated by Dr. S.:

"To urge the consideration that 'we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ,' the Apostle Paul undeniably cites and argues from this passage; 'It is written, *As I live saith the Lord, unto me every knee shall bow; and every tongue shall render acknowledgment to God*; so then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.' (Rom. xiv. 4.) That here is an intended application of the passage to Christ is at least corroborated by another reference of the Apostle, '*That in the name of Jesus every knee may bow, of beings in heaven and on the earth and under the earth, and that every tongue may acknowledge that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*'" (Phil. ii. 10, 11.)

From Dr. S.'s own pages we take the sufficient answer to this argument, and we should have no fear, without saying a word more, of leaving the matter "to the reflecting and candid reader."

"The interpretation proposed by Faustus Socinus, and generally adopted by his followers, is perspicuously stated by Dr. Priestley. 'The judgment-seat of Christ, and that of God, are the same, not because Christ is God, but because he acts in the name and by the authority of God, which is fully expressed when it is said, that God will judge all the world by Jesus Christ; so that being judged by Christ and by God is in effect the same thing.' (Priestley's Notes on Scripture, Vol. IV. p. 330.) By this gratuitous assertion the difficulty is evaded; but whether it is not advanced to serve the purpose, whether it is not far-fetched, while the other sense is near and obvious, and whether it duly comports with the terms and scope of the passage, and with the argument of the citation—the reflecting and candid reader will judge."

The Scriptures speak in some places of God judging the world, in others, of our all appearing before the judgment-seat of Christ, and again of God judging the world *by that man whom he hath ordained*. Passages of the latter kind, preventing the possibility of the two former being taken as proving the identity of God and Christ, leave us no alternative but to say that "the judgment of Christ and of God are the same, because Christ acts in the name and by the authority of God." Yet this is called a *gratuitous* assertion. The explanation, it seems, is advanced *to serve a purpose*: the same may be said of every explanation as easily, and of none with more appearance of justice than of those contained in Dr. S.'s volume: it is an accusation of prejudice (for we will not suppose that artifice is insinuated)—

prejudice, from which every one thinks himself free, and which each attributes to his opponent. *Far-fetched* often has reference only to the established associations of the person using the term, as *obvious* may only signify what readily occurs to him, having his mind preoccupied with a theory. It is clear that no one would have applied the original passage to our Lord, but for the Apostle's quotation: let us inquire then what was *his* meaning. He is urging those whom he addresses not to indulge in mutual censures, from the consideration of the future judgment to which they would all equally be called, and for which it would become them better to prepare, "since we must all present ourselves before the tribunal of Christ; for it is written, *As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall acknowledge God.*" So then every one of us must give an account of himself to God." The Apostle quotes the words of the prophet as declaring that all should be judged. To shew that the judgment of God and of Christ are the same, is necessary to the sense of the passage: this is done satisfactorily by observing that God judges *through Christ*; it is not done satisfactorily by affirming that Christ is God, because that assertion is inconsistent with the declaration that "God will judge the world *by that man whom he hath appointed.*" But has Dr. S. never noticed, or does he regard as insignificant, a various reading in Rom. xiv. 10, where, for "we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ," a not inconsiderable number of copies read—"of God:" which, if admitted, would at once put an end to his argument? We are hardly prepared, as Mr. Belsham has done in his Translation of the Epistles, to introduce this reading into the text, but we cannot do less than pronounce it very probably true, and there ought to be little importance attached to an argument which rests on the correctness of *one* of two readings in so very doubtful a case. Our interpretation of Paul's meaning suits equally well to either.*

The next Section (numbered, like the preceding, xxv. by an error continued from the first edition) relates to the expression Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, xxxiii. 15, 16, "Jehovah our righteousness." The Unitarian interpretation, also adopted by some "who have no prepossession in favour of Antitrinitarian doctrines," and by the best of the Jewish commentators, is, that the title is given not as a personal appellative, but as a descriptive name, like Immanuel, Isa. vii. 14; Maher-shalal-hash-baz, Isa. viii. 1; Ariel, Isa. xxix. 1; Magor-Missabib, Jer. xx. 3; El-Elohe-Israel, *God, the God of Israel*, the name of an altar, Gen. xxxiii. 20; Jehovah-nissi, *Jehovah my banner*, Exod. xvii. 15, an altar so called by Moses; Jehovah-shalom, *Jehovah of peace*,

* Griesbach places Θεσ in his inner margin with the secondary mark of probability (which he explains to mean that the reading is not to be despised, and is worthy of farther examination, yet inferior to the received). It is found in the principal MSS. of the Western recension, as well as in the Alexandrian MS., which, in the epistles, more generally exhibits the Alexandrine recension. Griesbach prefers the reading of the received text, as belonging both to the Alexandrine and Byzantine recensions, and probably because he thought that Θεσ might have been written for the sake of consistency with the following verse. We submit, with all due respect for so acute and impartial a judge, that it is more probable Χρισθ was written instead of Θεσ, in imitation of 2 Cor. v. 10, Τὸς γὰρ πάντας ἡμεῖς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; that the Western recension, however much to be distrusted respecting changes dependent on the mere substitution of letters, or respecting additions to the text, is less than either of the others to be suspected of a critical change; and that the Common or Byzantine text can in a case of this kind add nothing to the authority of the Alexandrine recension, so that the balance of probability *rather inclines* in favour of the reading Θεσ.

Judges vi. 29, an altar so named by Gideon, because God said to him, "Peace be to thee;" and Jehovah-Shammah, *Jehovah is there*, Ezek. xlviii. 35, the name of the predicted city. Many personal appellatives among the Hebrews were constructed on the same principle, as Elijah, *my God Jah*; ZEDEKIAH, the *righteousness of Jah*; Hiel, the *living God*, 1 Kings xvi. 34, the name of a Bethelite who rebuilt Jericho. That the name *Jehovah our righteousness*, meaning "Jehovah will give us justification through him, or in his time," should be used as descriptive of the blessings of the Messiah's kingdom, can seem strange to no one, whatever view of the nature of those blessings, and the person of him through whom they were bestowed, he may adopt. Dr. S., whilst acknowledging that "if the person of the Messiah were indubitably ascertained to be only human," which we think that it is by abundant evidence, "this appellation would be merely a descriptive proposition," maintains that "there is a consideration which especially belongs to the very phrase of this passage," corroborating the evidence for considering the name as strictly expressing the nature of Christ, which he supposes to be furnished by other parts of Scripture. This consideration is, that "*righteousness* (or justification) is the capital blessing of the gospel," and "is most definitively attributed to Jesus Christ. Every other righteousness is disowned and rejected in comparison with his." We should think this the very reason why the promise of righteousness or justification from God through him should be expressed, as being of eminent importance, by a descriptive name. But, perhaps, Dr. S. means by justification being *definitively attributed to HIM*, that it is attributed to him rather than to God the Father, that it *originated* with him, and is his peculiar work. Let us then see how far the passages to which he himself refers in the New Testament agree with this notion: Philipp. iii. 9, "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is OF GOD by faith." 1 Cor. i. 30, "Christ Jesus, who OF GOD is made unto us wisdom, and *righteousness*, and sanctification;" add 2 Cor. v. 21, "For he hath made him to be sin (treated him as a sinner) for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the *righteousness of GOD* in him," might obtain justification from God through him. It is strange to say, in the face of these passages, that the righteousness or justification belongs to Christ essentially as distinguished from the Father. To us they appear to agree most exactly with the interpretation of "*Jehovah our righteousness*," as a descriptive name of the Messiah given above. It may be added, that in the second passage, Jer. xxxiii. 16, some have supposed, not without considerable probability in their favour, that the epithet is given to Jerusalem, and that the learned Dr. Blayney (whom Dr. S. does not condescend to notice) translates the words, "*Jehovah shall call his name 'our righteousness.'*"

The argument in Section xxvi., on Dan. vii. 9, 10, 13, 14, is so fanciful, that even Dr. S. himself would hardly attribute to it much *independent* value, and we are sure that none of our readers will think it needs refutation. In the book of Revelation, the visionary scenes of which are every where expressed in language imitating, or borrowed from, the ancient prophets, the account of the vision of our glorified Lord contains some of the same words, and one descriptive circumstance, ("his head and his hair were white like wool," of radiant brightness,) the same as Daniel has used in representing "the Ancient of days," who is manifestly the Supreme Being himself. This is called so *definite* and *striking* a coincidence, "that the latter cannot but be regarded as designedly alluding to the former."

Hence it is expected we should be ready to believe the identity of Christ with the Ancient of days. Now, when it is said (Dan. vii. 13) that "one like to a SON OF MAN approached to the ANCIENT OF DAYS, and was brought near to his presence," Dr. S. thinks the word rendered *was brought near*, though "it does not necessarily imply more than a near approach, may be justly extended to the expression of a personal union. Its radical idea is that of very close contact; and its different forms are applied to many instances of conjunction, indwelling, and union, the most near and intimate that can exist amongst men. Upon these grounds it is submitted as a fair and rational interpretation of the whole passage, to view it as declaring, in the symbolical language of prophecy, an assumption of the frail and humble nature of a child of man into an absolute union with the great ETERNAL."

The meaning of the Hebrew word is "to be, or be brought near." It is used equally of friendly and hostile approach, of nearness in place, time, relationship, dignity, or favour. By a very natural application of the idea of nearness, it is used as a name for what is within us, in reference either to the body or the mind. We can see nothing mysterious or abstruse in its applications, and the idea of extorting from the words, "one like to a son of man was brought near TO THE PRESENCE of the Ancient of days," a declaration of the "absolute union of a child of man with the GREAT ETERNAL," is perfectly monstrous. Yet our author is one who is ever ready to reproach Unitarians with *far-fetched* interpretations invented to serve a purpose.

The passage in Micah, which is treated of in the xxviii Section, contains the words, (according to Dr. S.'s translation,) "whose comings forth are from eternity, from the days of the everlasting period," which he calls "a clear assertion (respecting the Messiah) of prior and eternal existence." The literal version is, "whose descent* is from ancient times,† from the days of old.‡" The passage is interpreted by Grotius, Dathe, and others, as applying primarily to Zerubbabel, affirming the ancient glory of his family. If belonging strictly and solely to the Messiah, it affirms his designation to his mission in the counsels of God, or perhaps, as it is connected with the mention of Bethlehem, his derivation from the family of David. What then becomes of the clear assertion of our Saviour's prior and eternal existence?

Section xxx. Zech. xii. 8—10. "They shall look unto me (Jehovah, as appears from the connexion) whom they have pierced." The words are applied to our Lord, John xix. 37, where they are quoted, "They shall look upon him whom they have pierced." Dr. S. concludes that Christ is Jehovah. We hold it to be very evident that the Apostle John only accommodates to his purpose the words of Zechariah, as, according to the most judicious critics, he has done other passages of Scripture in the same narrative of our Lord's death. With Grotius we understand the prophet to use the word *pierced* figuratively for "treated with insult and injury;" but if it should be thought that the passage in Zechariah is prophetic of the circum-

* מוצאתיו ortus, origines ejus.

† קדם, the root, signifies to precede or go before; as a noun, what is before; as 1, the east, whence the sun seems to come; 2, former times, antiquity to an indefinite extent, but without the idea of eternity, except incidentally from the nature of the subject with which it is connected.

‡ עולם, eternity, indefinite duration, past or future, often signifying former times: thus ימות עולם, "the days of old," Deut. xxxii. 7; עם עולם, "the people of former times," Ezek. xxvi. 20; כמתי עולם, "as the dead of former times," those who have been long dead, Psalm cxliii. 3, &c.

stances attending the death of Christ, many MSS., by the addition of only a letter, read "look on him," instead of "on me," which reading is preferred by Kennicott, Newcome, &c. One distinguished critic (Dr. Blayney, see his translation of Zechariah) thinks the present Hebrew words may be translated "look on him," and others render them "look to me (i. e. for pardon) *with respect to him* whom they pierced." So that there can be no necessity for supposing the prophet to have spoken of Jehovah being literally pierced, a sentiment which would have excited the indignation and horror of all his countrymen.

Section xxxi. Zech. xiii. 7. "Sword! awake against my shepherd, against the man of my resemblance, saith Jehovah of hosts." So Dr. S.; our Common Version has "the man that is *my fellow*;" Archbishop Newcome, "the man that is *near unto me*;" Dr. Blayney, "that is next unto me," observing in a note that it means "next unto me in power and authority, and corresponds with my shepherd in the parallel line; one that rules his flock or people under me by virtue of my commission," and he quotes Calvin to the same purpose. The Hebrew word is explained in the lexicons a *friend, neighbour, or companion*. The radical meaning is *participation*, having something in common. Dr. S., as might be expected, contends for *equality of rank and identity of nature*. More modestly and justly Dr. Boothroyd:

"I adhere to the version, *my fellow*, because I think there is the same *ambiguity* in the term, as in the original: it may mean 'his intimate friend and associate; one engaged in that work which his wisdom had planned from eternity; or it may signify the man who is at the same time a Divine person, *my equal*,' as enjoying the same nature"—Boothroyd, as quoted by Smith, Script. Test. p. 477, note, 2nd ed.

The words, in truth, may be accommodated to, but *can never prove*, the doctrine of Christ's deity, and it is proof which we require.

We have now examined *every text* adduced by Dr. S. from the Old Testament, which, as translated and interpreted by him, contains any thing inconsistent with the Unitarian doctrine, and we submit our remarks to the inquiring and candid reader with great confidence as to the result. There may be a few passages which, supposing the Deity of Christ, and his participation in the peculiar and sacred name *Jehovah*, to be independently and incontestably established, might admit of interpretation conformably with those doctrines, but there is not one which does not admit of *ready and natural* explanation on other principles, and the greater number may perhaps seem to be *incapable of bearing* the sense which has been assigned to them. We have a few observations yet to offer on the remaining portions of Dr. S.'s Second Book. But we think we have already established solid ground for the conclusion, not only as has been admitted by many learned defenders of the Trinity, that no proof of that doctrine can be found in the Old Testament, but that nothing at all plausible can be thence produced in favour of the reputedly orthodox views respecting our Lord's person, and therefore that an examination of the evidence of the *New Testament* is abundantly sufficient to determine the controversy, and Mr. Belsham was by no means called upon to say any thing more on the passages appealed to from the Old Testament, than he has had the opportunity of saying conformably with the plan he has adopted.

(To be continued.)

ANDERSON'S HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF THE NATIVE IRISH.*

To an impartial and reflecting observer reviewing the history of mankind, there will, perhaps, appear few objects more singular and inexplicable, more difficult to reconcile to what might be expected to be the prevailing motives of action with enlightened statesmen and civilized nations, than the past and present condition of Ireland. Such an observer, now for the first time directing his attention to the history and circumstances of this country, would not be easily brought to believe it possible that a land richly endowed with a fertile soil, a temperate climate, and a situation yielding to none in the facilities afforded for intercourse with all the world, blessed by Providence apparently with all the natural requisites for wealth and prosperity, whose inhabitants have been connected for centuries, by the most intimate political ties, with a people who claim to be the first upon the earth for civilization, refinement, and philanthropy, should nevertheless, in respect of a large portion of its population, be more abandoned and destitute of the fair advantages of intellectual or moral culture than any other people above the rank of savages. That a community, generally understood to be sufficiently alive to their own interests, should continue obstinately ignorant of the actual condition and natural resources of a country almost visible from their own shores, with which they are more closely united than with any other, and whose progress in wealth and cultivation is more nearly connected with, and more powerfully influences their own than that of any other nation whatever, would seem at first view a most strange and unaccountable paradox. Yet so it has been; and, though there are symptoms of approaching change, so in a great measure it continues to be to this day. An enterprising people, whose self-interest and curiosity incite them to explore every other corner of the habitable globe in pursuit of wealth and of knowledge, allow one of the most valuable portions of it at their own doors to remain, if not absolutely a *terra incognita*, at least very imperfectly examined; a people in general deservedly celebrated for their zealous exertions to spread the blessings of knowledge and the gospel throughout every clime, allow several millions of their fellow-subjects, nominally united under the same political constitution, and entitled to share in all its privileges and distinctions, to remain in a state of gross intellectual, moral, and spiritual darkness.

We have been led into these reflections by a very interesting and valuable work recently published, the title of which we have prefixed, containing, along with much ingenious reasoning and eloquent remonstrance, some extraordinary and startling facts, which, notwithstanding that they relate to the condition and circumstances of three or four millions of our countrymen in Ireland, will, if we mistake not, be almost, if not altogether, new to the great bulk of its English readers. We refer more particularly to the information which it contains respecting the comparative prevalence of the English and Irish languages; the history of the measures, to say the least of them, impolitic and absurd, which have been and are still pursued with reference to this subject, and the course which a more liberal and enlightened as well as truly Christian policy would suggest.

* Historical Sketches of the Native Irish and their Descendants, illustrative of their past and present State with regard to Literature, Education, and Oral Instruction. By Christopher Anderson.

There are none, perhaps, who need to be informed that the native Irish or Erse language is one out of four dialects of the ancient Celtic which continue to be spoken in the British Isles. It differs in some particulars from the Welsh and the Gaelic, but bears so close a general resemblance that persons familiar with either, especially with the latter, can make themselves intelligible to the Irish without much difficulty, and would probably be able in a short time to acquire such a mastery in the kindred dialect as not only to be understood, but to be competent to address to those who speak it the voice of oral instruction. It is said, (but here we must acknowledge that we are merely repeating at second-hand the reports of others without the means of verifying their accuracy,) it is said, that the Irish is a peculiarly copious and expressive language, well adapted for the purposes of oratory, and possessing the advantage—no inconsiderable one, both in this respect, and with a view to the more important object of facilitating the reception and comprehension of whatever may be communicated by means of it even to the more illiterate—that all its roots are native, the derivatives from which are framed upon analogies uniform and belonging to the language itself. These are considerations which would alone be sufficient to attract to this language, as an interesting object of philological inquiry, the attention of those who are curious in such researches; independently of the important light which many productions in prose and verse extant in MS. in various public libraries, but hitherto little explored, might probably throw upon the early history and literature of these islands; at a period, too, when there is good reason to believe that Ireland was the repository and refuge of no small portion of the learning which yet remained amidst the comparative darkness of Western Europe.

But by far the most interesting light in which this subject can be considered, both as belonging to the present times, and as coming more home, as it were, to our own business and bosoms, is the relation which it bears to the condition and character, intellectual, political, moral, religious, of the present inhabitants of that country. And upon this point we think there is good reason to believe that the public in general in this country, and even in Ireland itself, require to be disabused of many deeply-rooted prejudices, and must be called upon to shake off many erroneous impressions. We are much mistaken if it is not the received doctrine on this side of the channel, that the native Irish is fast hastening to extinction. It may still prevail, it is supposed, in mountainous regions, lurking among bogs and other inaccessible fastnesses, but the great mass of the people in all the more populous and cultivated districts habitually use the English tongue. Those who had cherished such an idea, will be surprised to learn that the reverse is the truth; that there is not a single county in Ireland of which it can be said that English is universally the vernacular dialect of the people; that in Connaught, at least nine-tenths of the people speak only Irish; and that if the whole country were polled, a very considerable majority of the entire population would be found to be in the same predicament. There are, indeed, no authentic documents from whence any exact conclusion can be derived, but the personal investigations made by Mr. Anderson in an extensive tour through the country with an express view to this inquiry, and the concurrent testimony of many well-informed individuals, whose feelings and prejudices in other respects would in some instances have tempted them rather to underrate than to magnify the amount, leave no reason to doubt that the statement is substantially correct.

It is admitted that a certain proportion of this class of the people are also

able to speak English, and are even under the necessity, to a certain extent, of speaking it daily. But to what does this extend, and what is its character? It is often such as an Englishman can hardly understand; and, after all, merely the language of barter or of business; just so much as is necessary for maintaining an unavoidable intercourse with his employers or superiors. But "is this English expressive of the thoughts, the opinions, the feelings of the man? Not at all; he has another medium, to which he instantly flies; and when his sentiments and feelings are to be heard, they may sound like a jargon in the ear of an Englishman, precisely as English sounds in his ear when so employed. These two men may plough in the same field, or drive the same machine; they are brought into contact; but as for interchange of sentiment and feeling, it is denied them." The consequence is, that in many districts of wide extent, the better educated, and what ought to be the influential classes, the gentry, the magistracy, the clergy, all other professional men, are separated by an insurmountable barrier from all effective or really beneficial communication with the great mass of the people. They may, perhaps, be able to drive an ordinary bargain, to transact their stated secular business, or even to maintain the daily intercourse of master and servant, in respect of such things as fall within the servant's stipulated employment; but as to any thing deserving the name of conversation, any thing involving an appeal to passion or sentiment, any thing in the nature of advice, admonition, remonstrance, or persuasion, any thing affording scope for the exercise of a moral influence over the affections and conduct, it must be immediately perceived that such an imperfect medium is altogether inadequate and unfit. It is scarcely necessary to add, that the number is still more limited of those to whom English is not vernacular, who are capable of understanding so as to profit by a set discourse or sermon addressed to them in that language. The consequence is, that this circumstance alone completely excludes the majority of the clergy from all spiritual intercourse with, or influence over, the bulk of their nominal parishioners.

What seems not a little remarkable is, that this anomalous situation of the Irish clergyman or gentleman has been very generally represented almost as a matter of indifference.

"Dr. Woodward, the Bishop of Cloyne, after having stated that the difference of language is a very general (and, where it obtains, an *insurmountable*) obstacle to any intercourse with the people, adds very coolly in a note, 'If it be asked, why the *clergy* do not *learn* the Irish language, I answer, that it should be the object of government rather to take measures to bring it into entire disuse.' Nay, though it is quite practicable to speak both English and Irish with the utmost propriety, the childish bugbear of an *Irish accent* was held over the head of any gentleman who should think of acquiring the Irish language. Even in Hardy's *Life of Lord Charlemont*, we find the following passage: 'I have heard many gentlemen among us talk much of the great convenience to those who live in the country that they should speak Irish. *It may possibly be so*; but I think they should be such as never intend to visit England on pain of being ridiculous; for I do not remember to have heard of any one man that spoke Irish, who had not the accent upon his tongue easily discernible to any English ear!'"

But for the proof exhibited in such passages as these, one would scarcely conceive it possible that any mind accustomed to reflection could be so inconsiderate, or so perverted by deeply-rooted prejudice, as to conceive it to be a matter of small importance whether those persons who are raised by

political institutions, by wealth, by profession, or education, to rank with the more influential classes of society, should be enabled to exercise that influence by free communication with their inferiors in their own language, or should be separated by this impassable gulf from those whom they might admonish, advise, instruct in the things which minister both to their temporal and eternal welfare. That such should be in any degree the relative condition of the higher and lower classes, we certainly consider as a very great evil, placing a thousand formidable impediments in the way of the political and moral improvement of the people. But the idea of removing this evil, by extirpating one prevalent language and substituting another, by inducing four millions of people to unlearn their mother tongue, the vehicle in which they have been accustomed to think, and to convey not only their ideas, but their sentiments, emotions, and affections, in order to adopt the speech of a race whom they habitually regard as strangers and intruders, not to say oppressors, is altogether visionary, and is discountenanced by the whole history of mankind. The pertinacity with which a nation under such circumstances adhere to its primitive language, as this writer very justly observes, is illustrated by no example more remarkably than by the history of the English language itself. After the Norman conquest, the idiom of our Saxon ancestors for three centuries lay in a sort of disgrace, neglected and despised as a barbarous jargon by the learned and the great. Norman-French was the language of the court, of the law, of all the privileged orders, while English was spoken chiefly by the mechanic, the peasant, and the slave. But continuing to be the dialect of the great mass of the people, it finally prevailed against its rival, and made its way even into the courts of justice and the halls of the nobility. With this example derived from their own history before their eyes, it seems strange that any enlightened and reflecting man should seriously recommend such a scheme as that of putting down by legal enactments and other artificial means the language of a whole people. Yet this appears to have been the policy of the rulers of Ireland for a course of centuries. The means adopted have in general been worthy of the end, and the success such as might have been expected. Education has been recommended, and schools have been established; but they have been exclusively *English* schools, whose main object seems to be to communicate just so much English as shall suffice for the ordinary transactions of every-day life. The consequence has been, not that they have learned English, but that they have remained uninstructed. Beyond all question, if the object be to improve the intellectual condition of a people, the proper method is to *commence* with instruction in their native tongue. The establishment of *Irish* schools, however, has been not only neglected, but discouraged by all possible means. During the whole of the eighteenth century, *not one* edition appeared of the Scriptures in the Irish language! and though the Bible Society have recently directed their attention to this point, what has yet been done is but little in proportion to the immense magnitude of the object. It is scarcely necessary to add, that an elementary literature adapted to the wants and circumstances of the Irish people, remains to be created.

Mr. Anderson argues ingeniously, and we think not unplausibly, to shew that even if the object be to promote among the native Irish the use of the English tongue, still the proper course to pursue will be to *begin* by instruction in Irish. By this, if well and judiciously conducted, you impart a thirst for knowledge, which, certainly at present, and most probably under any circumstances that are likely to arise in Ireland, can be gratified only by

means of books or by instruction communicated in English. You may thus eventually make the acquisition of this language a matter of choice and desire; an important object indeed, but one which can never be accomplished either by violence or neglect.

Some very interesting particulars are given of a system of what are called Circulating Schools, originally introduced in Wales by Mr. Griffith Jones, and since extensively pursued by Mr. Charles, of Bala. A schoolmaster is provided who shall teach the poor to read and write their own language. He is not to reside permanently at *any* particular place, but to remain for a short period, say from six to twelve months, after which he removes elsewhere. The knowledge that he has come for a limited period naturally excites emulation and diligence, and the anticipation of his removal suggests an earnest desire that the flame which he has kindled should not be permitted to die away. Some of the more diligent and attentive of the pupils accordingly are generally found able and willing to conduct an evening school after the teacher has taken his departure, to bestow the same benefit upon another district; and in this manner, in the midst of much poverty and many difficulties, a considerable portion of that elementary knowledge which is the vehicle of religious and moral instruction, has been very widely diffused among the Welsh peasantry at a comparatively very moderate expense. And though much remains to be done, the contrast certainly is prodigious between their present condition and the utter destitution, as far as the means of instruction in their vernacular dialect are concerned, of their Irish brethren. Mr. Anderson warmly urges the adoption of a similar system in Ireland. The experiment has been tried with success both in Wales and the Highlands of Scotland; the field of exertion in the sister island is more than four times as extensive, but, as far at least as Protestants are concerned, has been hitherto almost entirely neglected.

We have said, as far as Protestants are concerned; but it must not be overlooked that the native Irish are almost universally Catholics; a fact which cannot be much wondered at when we consider that to them the Scriptures have ever been not only a sealed, but an inaccessible book, and that the instances are very rare in which Protestant ministers of any denomination have even possessed the means of communicating with them in the only medium by which the word either of instruction, admonition, argument or persuasion, can be addressed to them; the only language in which a continued discourse appealing to their understandings, and still more to their hearts, would be intelligible to them. And it is the principal fault we have to find with this book, that it gives us no insight whatever into the measures adopted by the Catholic clergy with respect to this portion of the people of their own communion. It is mentioned indeed incidentally, that not only is there no teacher of Irish at Trinity College, Dublin, but in the Catholic Seminary of Maynooth no such department was originally contemplated. Perhaps, however, to them it is less necessary, because the probability is, that a large proportion of the Catholic priesthood are derived from that portion of the people with whom the Irish language is vernacular. That this circumstance gives them a powerful influence over the lower classes of their countrymen there can be no doubt; and that this influence is unspeakably promoted by the power which they possess of maintaining a more intimate communication with the people in their own language is highly probable. We could wish to learn more accurately the extent to which they have availed themselves of these opportunities for promoting the spread of real and substantial improvement. They have been much belied if such advantages

have not been either miserably neglected, or perverted to the mere purpose of keeping up a priestly domination over a superstitious and ignorant race. But be this as it may, surely it argues a most unaccountable supineness in the Protestants of all ranks and denominations, that this vast field has for so long a period been utterly abandoned by them, and that for centuries no attempt has been made to diffuse among so large a portion of their countrymen either more correct views of religion, or even the secular instruction so necessary to increase their usefulness as members of a community professing to be enlightened and civilized. If worthy successors had risen up to enter upon the labours of Mr. Boyle, and more especially of the excellent and venerable Bishop Bedell, things would not have been as they now are in either of these respects. But by studiously confining all education to the English tongue, in which alone books were printed, the instruction of schools conveyed, or religious worship conducted, the Protestant clergy have wilfully shut themselves out from all connexion with a large majority of the people. They are the ministers of the higher and more educated classes, and of them alone. Until this state of things is altered, it is in vain to expect that any material impression will be made upon the poor and ignorant peasantry of Ireland, either in a moral or a political point of view. They will not till then take the place to which their numbers and the natural resources of their country would seem to entitle them, in adding to the power and prosperity of the British empire; they will not till then feel themselves effectually united, not merely by constitutional forms, but in interest, and by the consciousness of reciprocal sympathy and good-will, with the great mass of their nominal countrymen.

We have entered upon these statements, not so much in order to propose or recommend any specific remedy for existing evils, as to call the attention of our readers to a subject of deep interest, whether we regard it as a national question, or as materially affecting the moral and religious welfare of a numerous body of our fellow-men. It is much more easy to point out a different course of policy which, if it had been steadily pursued during the last two centuries, would have placed us in a more desirable situation, than to say what is now to be done to correct the mischiefs of an erroneous system so long and so pertinaciously acted upon. We are aware that great practical difficulties oppose the establishment of a really beneficial intercourse between the English Protestant clergyman or minister and the Irish Catholic labourer. It is perhaps not much more likely that the one class, taken as a body, will learn Irish, than that the other will learn English;—in such a manner, we mean, as that either language shall be so spoken and understood by both parties as to fit it for becoming the medium of religious instruction, or of moral persuasion when addressed to the heart and the feelings. Still, however, we are persuaded that much might already be done—by the introduction of circulating, and where practicable, as it would be in most of the towns, of local *Irish* schools;—by the preparation and extensive distribution of cheap *Irish* tracts, both of a religious nature, and on the various branches of useful knowledge peculiarly interesting to the poor;—by the employment of missionaries competent to address the lower orders in their own language;—by the establishment of *Irish* chapels for Protestant religious worship (not one of which, we believe, at present exists from one end of the island to the other);—by encouraging properly qualified persons, who might probably be found in the more fortunate Celtic districts of Wales and the Highlands of Scotland, to assume this character for the benefit of their brethren in Ireland. If in any of these ways a general thirst for improvement

was excited in the great body of the people, and the insuperable obstacles removed which at present render almost all useful knowledge inaccessible to them, we might safely leave the inherent talent and energy of the people themselves, whose natural character is by no means that of apathy or stupidity, to accomplish the rest.

"Did this people (to adopt the expressions of the work before us) constitute only a small proportion of the population, our duty by them would be the same; but when their number in comparison with the aggregate body has become so large, it is not saying too much when we affirm, that there is nothing which essentially regards their best interests that can safely be viewed but as a subject of national importance. It is not denied that in contemplating the interests of the United Kingdom generally, the effectual improvement of Ireland is now the question of by far the greatest national importance. It is no longer important to Ireland alone, but almost equally so both to England and Scotland; and that not since the Union only, but since the application of steam-navigation. For though, always lying in the bosom of Great Britain, as if intended by nature for the most intimate and cordial connexion, past ages have shewn how possible it is for nations, 'intersected by a narrow frith,' to abhor each other. These days are now past, it is hoped, for ever; at all events, the state is now *one*, and the moral condition of any given spot in it must needs become the interest of all; otherwise it cannot now be long before the effects are felt in every corner of the empire. Let not then the present condition of the Native Irish population be disregarded. Setting political union altogether out of view, a bridge across St. George's Channel could not more effectually have opened up Ireland to us, or this country to it, than the invention referred to has done. To check or obstruct intercourse between the people of these lands, if once practicable, is now impossible. The channel between them is now no obstruction; and the people of both countries, to a great degree, like kindred waves, must affect each other, if not mingle into one. Already we have about ninety or a hundred thousand of the Irish in London, about or above thirty thousand in Glasgow and its neighbourhood, to say nothing of other places.

"Past neglect may be regretted; so it ought to be, and so it will; but the crisis to which we have come is not to be deplored. It had been far better for both countries had it arrived long since. An interchange of kind offices is now not a thing of choice—a matter of opinion, if we have any regard to the prosperity and morals of Great Britain; and it is a good thing when circumstances conspire to render the duty we owe to God and man imperative. If we are governed by sound Christian principle, the improvement of such Irish districts must follow as one effect of frequent intercourse. This may, or at least certainly should, rouse to the duties of brotherhood, and ultimately increase the sum of national happiness, and peace, and power."

We cannot conclude without earnestly recommending both this work and its subject to the serious attention of those who have a rational concern either for the true prosperity of their country, or for the happiness and improvement of their species.

W. T.

EXPOSITION OF PROFESSOR JACOTOT'S SYSTEM OF EDUCATION.*

THE first thing to be examined into in considering the pretensions of any new system of education is its harmony with the whole constitution of the beings who are to be subjected to it. Nothing is easier than to discover methods by which separate portions of the human creature may be brought to a very high degree of perfection, provided other portions are left out of consideration; and a partial system may promise great things and perform all its promises without being at all fit for general adoption. Many an idiot with a marvellous memory has been made an idiot by the education of his memory. Many a dyspeptic mathematician would willingly give up some of his scientific attainment, if his dyspepsia would go with it. Many a man, the workings of whose intellect are unusually true, sighs for that harmony of spirit with God and man of which he has been deprived by being taught to pursue means as ends. It is quite as possible to make a child a prodigy of philosophy or learning at fifteen (at the risk of sending him out of the world at that age) as it is to make an infant twice the average size of infants by pouring in as much cream as the digestive organs will bear. The great question is, not whether these feats may be achieved, but whether it is desirable that they should be achieved; and before the claims of any new mode of education are investigated, it should be ascertained whether, granting them to be sound in themselves, they are likely to interfere with other claims of greater importance.

Nobody disputes this; and yet what dreadful havoc do we daily see introduced into the constitution of the future man by the neglect of so plain a consideration! So bitter is the heart-ache which compassionate observers feel from witnessing the destruction of some component part or another of the unhappy pupils of new systems, that they are tempted, in contradiction to reason, to conclude that a fortuitous education is the best thing that children can be blessed with after all. Such a conclusion is monstrous, we allow; but some excuse is to be made for it in the presence of all the immediate pain, and in prospect of all the future harm, caused by that exaggeration of systems already partial and exaggerated which now strikes us wherever we turn our eyes. It is melancholy to see a train of children going out to walk with open lesson books in their hands. It is melancholy to see the trickling tears which mock the parent while he talks of the primary necessity of interesting children in what they learn. It is melancholy to see the irritability induced by perpetual interrogation, and the dislike to learn caused by the obligation to be always learning. It would be ludicrous, if it were not melancholy, to see little ones of eight years old drawing maps of the English Constitution, and explaining the relations of the legislative and executive departments, of King, Lords, and Commons, before they have learned any thing of domestic government but what they must detest. It is really not to be wondered at that good-natured people would rather see these victims of system with the rosy face and round eyes of a ploughboy, and as stupid as he, than dwindled in body and crushed in mind as they are too often at present seen to be.—The prospect is even worse than the present

* A Compendious Exposition of the Principles and Practice of Professor Jacotot's celebrated System of Education. By Joseph Payne. London. 1830.

Epitome Historiæ Sacræ, adapted, by a literal Translation, to Jacotot's Method. By Joseph Payne. London. 1831.

reality. What can come of the method (mistakenly called Pestalozzian) of interrogating children from morning till night, but that the timid will be dismayed and stupified, and the bold made superficial and conceited? Pestalozzi was perfectly right in avoiding the old system where all was communication on the part of the teacher and submissive reception on that of the pupil; but he little dreamed of what should be done in his name while he was doing every thing in the name of nature. If we may judge by much that we have seen, there will be, in a few years, an influx on society of conceited half-thinkers, of presumptuous all-knowers, who know nothing thoroughly, and have been too much habituated to answer questions when the solution was placed within their reach, to think of asking any when a reply is not quite so close at hand. We are far from wishing that the stir about education, through which all this has arisen, had not taken place. We are not so sanguine as to suppose that any reformation of importance can take place without the introduction and occasional prevalence of many errors; and we look for a certain, if not speedy, enlargement of views, and for a better direction of a very laudable zeal than that which has signalized the adoption of the many new systems of which we hear. What we desire is, not the relinquishment of what has been taught us from abroad, but its further prosecution; not a return to the Eton grammar on the one hand, or chance on the other, but that details should not be pursued to the exclusion of principles; that the great principle of education should be a regard to the greatest ultimate happiness of the pupil, and that the operation of this principle should be determined by the facts of the pupil's own constitution as well as by those of his location. This is professed to be the design of every system of education that is offered to notice; but we must acknowledge that we have found it pure and complete only in the quiet administration of parents who make their own good sense their chief guide, and who, while learning from every system, profess none.

Before science had driven chance from the conceptions and almost from the vocabulary of wise people, it was perfectly natural that an education of fortuitous influences should be supposed sometimes a very happy and sometimes a very harmless thing. But now that it is known to a certainty that there is no such thing as chance, and that a continually progressive power is given to the human will (in proportion to the enlargement of human knowledge) over all the agents whose nature can be discerned, it seems as barbarous a proceeding to leave a child to be educated by nature, as to leave it in the woods to be bred up by savages. Man has long been learning to modify the influences to which his offspring are exposed. Man is convinced that in course of time he will be able to do this so completely, that, having acquainted himself with the primary conditions of his children's being, he will be able to make them what he chooses; and, by means of the co-operation of a sufficient number of parents, to place the offspring of all in an atmosphere of virtue and wisdom by which their being shall be nourished up to a perfection we may conceive of, but must wait long to witness. We are now somewhere between the extremes of a fortuitous education and a perfectly conducted one. We are bustling and striving after some special methods in which we are apt to imagine resides general efficacy. We are so eagerly exerting our influence in some particular modes of operation, that we forget our equal responsibility in others. What good principles we have laid hold of, we do not carry out far enough; what specific processes we have found to be good, we are apt to apply too pertinaciously and too generally. Health is not yet, as it may be centuries hence, a matter of course; morals cannot be

taught merely by exercising the intellect, nor science by administering to the affections. We make our pupils learned at the expense of their nerves, and pious while we neglect their understandings; and yet exercise and diet are as much under our controul as religious influences, and the operations of the reasoning faculty as much as either.

Careful as we should be, therefore, in adopting any new systems of education, our proneness to the partial cultivation of our pupils should make us doubly watchful of those systems which relate only to particular departments of education. Among these is the system of Jacotot, which has nothing to do with physical or moral development, though it advances extraordinary pretensions as far as the intellect is concerned. Now, before we examine these pretensions, we must express our doubts whether this system can by any good management on the part of the teacher be pursued by the pupil with that relish,—whether it can ensure to him those encouragements and rewards which are essential to the healthful prosecution of any study, and to its beneficial moral effects. Of any but the intellectual results of these methods we know nothing; but we feel pretty sure that we could not in childhood have gone through such wearisome labour as is here prescribed without losing more in one way than we could gain in another.

“The Universal Instruction has but one route. The pupil is required to commit to memory the first six books of *Telemachus*, as an introductory exercise. These he must know perfectly, so as to be able to repeat them from one end to the other without the slightest hesitation; and whenever the teacher mentions the first word of a paragraph or sentence, to continue the paragraph or sentence without the omission of a single word. Many persons to whom this has been mentioned have been at once startled at what they considered so vast a requirement, not recollecting, at the same time, that much more, and to infinitely less purpose, is exacted from the pupil by the common method. When the six books of *Telemachus*, or an equivalent portion of any eminent work in the language which the pupil may be studying, is once thus thoroughly impressed on the memory, his labour is almost all over. Every exercise afterwards required of him is little better than amusement; he is in possession of all the necessary materials, and his mind will almost spontaneously employ them.”—“‘Learn then by heart and understand,’ says Jacotot, ‘the first six books of *Telemachus*, or an equivalent portion of any eligible work in the language to be acquired, and repeat it incessantly. Refer every thing else to this, and you will certainly learn the language.’ The following is the method proposed by Jacotot, in order to attain that perfect mental retention necessary to the efficient operation of this system.—The pupil must learn every day a sentence, a paragraph, or a page, according as his memory is more or less habituated to this exercise; and he must never fail to repeat all that he has previously learned, from the first word of the book. Thus, if he learns one sentence at first, on the following day he learns the next sentence, but repeats the two, commencing with the first word of that previously learned. The same method is pursued to the end of the sixth book. As, however, this repetition, as the pupil goes on, necessarily occupies much time, it is sometimes found advisable to divide the portion thus accumulating; but still the general repetition of the six books must have place at least twice a week. The oftener the whole is repeated, the more prompt and durable are the results.—It is confessed that the preceding exercise is tedious and wearisome, and great care is required on the part of the teacher to prevent it from becoming repulsive and disgusting to the pupil. Too much must not at first be exacted. If the child cannot learn a paragraph in a day, let him learn two sentences, one sentence, or even a single word. At all events he must learn something thoroughly; on the next day he will learn something more, still repeating what has been previously learned; and after a fortnight's practice,

there will be little reason to tax him with want of memory. When the pupil knows the first six books thoroughly, it is not necessary to commit the remaining eighteen to memory; but he must read every day some pages of them, with a degree of attention sufficient to enable him to *relate* what they contain.—This second exercise, however, on no account excludes the general or partial repetition of the first six books, which the pupil must go through at least once a week, even when they are fixed immoveably in his memory.” —Pp. 20, 26, 27.

This “introductory exercise” being finished, the elements of all science and wisdom are to be drawn out and framed into completeness by a system of interrogation, which we should think equally wearisome to teacher and pupil. Then follows a system of exercises, all bearing reference to the portions impressed on the memory; and the same (with the exception of the scientific part) has to be gone through with every new language that is learned. If, as it appears to us, all the mental processes which are necessary to the acquisition of the sciences are totally independent of this prodigious exertion of memory, the question comes to this—is this drudgery too heavy a tax to pay for the acquisition of a language? Feeling how our own understanding would be disgusted and our temper irritated by such a process, we conclude that it is. We do not doubt Jacotot’s promise, “You will certainly learn the language;” but we inquire, “At what cost?”

We have quite as strong a conviction that the intellectual results of such a plan of repetition cannot be good. Let any one’s experience declare whether to learn by rote is not to lose the power of judgment and the pleasures of taste, in reference to what is committed to memory. “No, I won’t learn it by heart,” said a little girl, about a pretty piece of poetry, “because I want to go on liking it.” Many who repent of their early voluntary exercises of memory, and who now find that to retain in perfect accuracy is not to enjoy, will sympathize with this child’s feeling. They will find how the pleasure arising from choice pieces committed to memory is irrecoverably gone, how impossible it is to reason on, judge, compare, and in any degree appreciate, what, by being retained in words, has lost its power of appealing to other associations. No allurements could incite us, no management could enable us, to reason on any thing presented in a form of words repeated twice a week with the vigour and freedom with which we should attack new thoughts, or even old ones, presented under a new mode of expression. It is very true that by Jacotot’s method a vast quantity of materials are stored up by the pupil; but we doubt whether the power of using them would not disappear during the process of accumulation. If we thought that the proved efficacy of Jacotot’s system depended as much as its advocates declare on this particular exercise, we should hesitate to express ourselves as we have done; for wonders have certainly been done in some societies of his disciples abroad. We will explain what we suppose to be the causes of success when we have given a brief account of the origin and nature of the system.

M. Jacotot, a native of Dijon, being made, in 1818, Professor of the French language at the University of Louvain, found himself called upon to teach the French language to pupils whose native tongue he did not understand. He gave them Fenelon’s *Telemaque*, with a Dutch translation, which they proceeded to commit to memory, discovering the meaning of the French text by a close comparison with the Dutch version. When thoroughly acquainted with half the first book, they began to compose in French, and succeeded to the astonishment of the Professor himself, who was thus led to the recognition of the great principle of his system—that the best way to

learn every thing is to *be told* nothing. Other experiments were tried in the same manner and with the same success ; the pupils being made to acquaint themselves thoroughly with a model, and then to draw all their materials from it, and fashion all their proceedings with a perpetual reference to it. It was found that they spontaneously observed every rule of orthography and grammar, until they proved themselves capable of writing as well as the author of their model-book, as far as style was concerned. Of the degree of resemblance between the style of each pupil and that of his master or fellow-pupil, we are not informed ; but we imagine that a diversity of styles can scarcely exist under this method.

It is plain that the grand characteristic of this system is, that the old method of teaching is directly reversed ; that the pupil is taught analytically instead of synthetically. This is an all-important difference, and one which will fully account for the beneficial results of Jacotot's plans, without obliging us to admit the desirableness of all the modes in which the principle is applied.

If it was necessary for every mind to go through all the labour which the discovery of the analytical process caused to those benefactors of the race who first made us acquainted with the true method of philosophizing, all who wished for the accelerated progress of science would exclaim against learners being exercised in any but the synthetical mode. It might then be well to accept as articles of belief principles deduced by the labour of others, and to confine the business of instruction to assistance in the application of those principles. But, since the materials may be and are so prepared as to render the analytical process speedy and easy to learners, since the results are certain, and there is no other method of making pupils sure of their principles, it seems the most evident thing possible that they should go through the whole process in its natural order. The whole process cannot indeed be dispensed with ; it is accomplished under the old system as well as the new, as often as any science is thoroughly learned ; the only difference (and it is a most important one) being, that in the one case the process is reversed, while in the other it is natural. Take the instance of grammar. On the old plan, the pupil was taught the principles of the science and most of its details before he had the slightest notion how to apply them. They remained in his memory, and could not be made his own till he could institute the process of analysis for himself ; till he could interpret the grammatical meaning of the language he heard or read or used by his own application of the hitherto senseless rules he had been obliged to lodge in his memory. Then, after all, he had to institute the synthetical process for himself ; and when he had done, found that the first attempt to pursue it was just so much extra labour, and the time employed in it just so much time lost.

On the new plan, the pupil hears nothing of the principles and rules of grammar till he is prepared, on a very slight suggestion, to discover and apply them for himself : and as he comes fresh to the subject, and his understanding is interested all the time, he can without delay or disgust proceed to the second part of his task, and compose grammatically immediately after having discovered the principles on which he is to advance. This method, if advantageous in one intellectual process, must be so in all ; and as much of the system of Jacotot as is involved in it has our cordial approbation. We say the same for the Hamiltonian or any other system, whatever may be the extraneous errors or peculiarities of each ; our business being with their relation to human welfare, and not with the merits of their discoverers or

advocates. Reading and even writing is taught on this principle by Jacotot. We have not made the experiment in either case ; but we have seen enough of the success attending the sort of half-way method between the old and the new plan which is proposed by Mrs. Williams's syllabic spelling, to be completely alienated from the alphabetical method, and quite disposed to believe that Jacotot's plan may be even better than hers, inasmuch as it embodies the same principle carried out to a greater length. On Mrs. Williams's plan, (for which she does not claim the merit of discovery,) the pupil is taught the consonants by their real sound, and not by the arbitrary names which serve no earthly purpose that we can divine ; then the vowels are taught in conjunction with the consonants : then syllables are learned as pictures. These are easily compounded with each other, and with different consonants, and the pupil can then read, finding out for himself, as it becomes necessary, how the syllables themselves are composed. It will be seen at once that there is a mixture of analysis and synthesis in this. Jacotot allows no such mixture. He teaches all the words of a sentence from the first as pictures, dividing them afterwards into syllables and then into letters. In our young days, it was a hard task to learn the word Constantinople. We lately saw a little girl of four years old, who had not long begun to learn on Mrs. Williams's plan, master the difficulty in a minute. Kuh-on, Con, St-an, Stan, Tin, O, Ple—Constantinople. Jacotot would have made her repeat the word entire, and then divide it, unless (as is most probable) she had previously learned from shorter exercises to take to pieces and put together for herself. Miss Edgeworth long ago told us how speedily and easily children might learn to read by a method nearly similar to this, and we have no difficulty in believing that Jacotot's pupils learn to read and write in about a fortnight.

We should not be surprised if the golden days of composers, editors, and postmasters, are coming ; for sure we are that the average goodness of hand-writing must be incalculably increased by the abolition of strokes and pot-hooks. Every one who teaches drawing knows that children always get on best when they begin upon a whole subject, provided it be simple enough. A little pupil who sets out with copying a cottage will draw it well as a whole, or in its separate parts, much sooner than one who begins with a sheet full of perpendicular lines, and goes on to as many horizontal lines, and then to a multitude of doors, and then to chimneys, and then to windows, so that he is heartily tired of all the parts before he is allowed to frame them into a meaning. It is exactly the same with writing, as we had the opportunity of observing long before we heard of Jacotot's system. We knew a little girl who had not begun to learn to write at six years old, which shocked every body but her parents very much. One day she got hold of a slate on which an exercise was neatly written in small hand. She copied a few words for amusement, and being pleased at the feat, did the same every day ; and in two months wrote a letter in which the childishness of the thought and expression was curiously contrasted with the beauty of the hand writing.

Having declared our entire approbation of the leading principle of Jacotot's system, (which is not separately insisted on with sufficient earnestness by Mr. Payne,) we pass on to others which are exalted above it in the work before us, as far as italics and large Roman type may be taken as indications of pre-eminence. The truth on which the Professor insists much and successfully, that it is not necessary to *explain* in order to *teach*, is clearly involved in what we have announced as the fundamental principle of the sys-

tem : for, while it is necessary to commence a synthetical course of instruction by the inculcation of rules, an analytical course can best be carried on by furnishing the pupil with materials, and merely suggesting by inquiry the way to make use of them, all impediments and foreign admixtures being at the same time carefully removed.

The favourite maxim of the school of Jacotot is, "All is in all:" their all-comprehensive rule, "Learn something thoroughly, and refer every thing else to it." That truth is one, and that therefore by a thorough discernment of any one of its manifestations all others may be penetrated, no philosopher will be disposed to question : but there may be an unlimited licence in the application of this mighty principle ; and the justice of the application depends on the advancement of the investigator. An angel may evolve all truth from a butterfly's wing ; but can we do it ? We will suppose that Jacotot may unfold the principles of mathematical science (though we could not) from *Telemaque* ; but have any of his pupils ever done it ? Granting that Fenelon himself was all-wise in mathematics, it would seem scarcely possible that the best disciplined pupil should be able to separate elements so multifariously compounded, and to arrange them into a perfect science ; and if he could, it would be a round-about way of making the attainment, since, with the same powers, he might achieve the work much more easily by contemplating rocks and seas, or the fixed and moving lights of heaven. But when we further consider that Fenelon was not all-wise in mathematics, that whatever scientific truth there is in his work is amalgamated with error, it is plain that though the winged ones who guide the spheres and wield the golden plummet may draw forth truth pure from its defilements wherever it may be, nothing can be more hopeless than the endeavour to urge to such an achievement an intellect which has not yet appropriated the very truth it is desired to evolve. The shepherd boy who measures the stars with a beaded string, and cuts his dial in the turf, is making a rapid progress in mathematical science in comparison with him who is labouring to deduce its principles from *Telemaque*. The one gathers his knowledge slowly, but directly from the mind of God ; the other, if at all, more slowly, indirectly, and deeply tainted with the errors of the intellect through which it has passed. Let it be understood that it is only to the injudicious application of the principle that we object, and that we are ready to admit its practical efficacy as well as substantial truth, under the restrictions which the present conditions of our intellect render necessary. There are examples enough before us of what may be done with small means, of the ample floods which may be poured out after a long accumulation of single drops from the minutest crevice, to authorize us to teach that "all is in all." What we question is, whether there is any occasion to filter, when the element may be had pure ; and further, whether the acts of detecting the source and drawing out its contributions do not presuppose that the labour is unnecessary. The prevalence of this presupposition strikes us more than any thing else in Mr. Payne's account of Jacotot's system. He would have us believe that the pupils learn every thing from *Telemaque*, while it is evident all the while that they must have elsewhere learned to observe, to compare, to judge, to abstract and generalize, and, in short, to philosophize : and when this is done, it matters comparatively little what subjects are placed before the mind. The method by which the intellect is here taught to philosophize is the same as that by which all sound intellects have ever philosophized. We approve it, of course ; and respect M. Jacotot for the success with which he has used it ; but it has nothing to do with *Telemaque* or any

other book whatever, and is peculiar to no system of education. The most extraordinary instance of presupposition that we have met with is the following: "Jacotot asserts that the youngest child can comprehend thoroughly the terms representing the most complex abstract notions; that is, if he previously well understands all the simple subordinate notions contained in those that are complex." This is tantamount to a declaration that an infant a year old may compose an oratorio, if he understands the laws of musical proportion, and their accordance with religious sentiment, together with the practical workings of the orchestra.

These remarks have left us little to say upon the rule, "Learn something thoroughly, and refer every thing else to it," but that, though practically useful when sufficiently restricted, it is pernicious in the extreme when applied without limitation. Since "all is in all," every thing *may* be learned by a reference to one thing; but whence comes all the prejudice of little minds, all the professional narrowness, all the sectarian bigotry, all the aristocratic exclusiveness, with which the world is cursed, but from the practice of referring all things to one thing? We know that neither M. Jacotot nor Mr. Payne could have contemplated so large an application of their principle as this. They would not recommend a beeman to look for all truth through the glass of his hive; nor a chemist to bring an opera to the test of his crucible; and are doubtless as ready as ourselves to laugh at the philosophers of Laputa riding their hobbies: but why leave to their readers to determine the bounds of their principle? Why needlessly provoke doubt or ridicule? Furthermore, we doubt the efficacy of the rule as far as they themselves carry it. If the reference was made to a sound *principle*, there could be no mistake; for there indeed would all be in all: but the reference is to be made to some emanation of the human intellect, (whether Fenelon's or some other,) to something imperfect, impure, and which must therefore be superseded. A necessary consequence is, that exact truth can scarcely be attainable by such means; and there is every danger that the intellect will be cramped, and the moral views distorted, by this subservience to something fallible, if not antiquated. Could Newton have framed his philosophy from the study of the best orrery that was ever made before his time or since? Till there is a divinely-constituted model presented, no exclusive dependence can be safe; no perpetual reference may be ventured on; no calculations founded on such a reference can be accurate; no deductions drawn from it can be pronounced perfect until sanctioned by other authority. Again, Newton might undoubtedly have developed his system by studying one constellation alone: but would this have been his wisest way, the surest, the speediest, the simplest? Certainly not. Neither is it the readiest way to verify the moral dicta of Massillon to recur to the "facts" of the fiction of Fenelon.

"To shew how the principle is verified, the teacher opens any author,—Massillon, for instance, and reads,

"Pleasure is the first thing that endangers our innocence. The other passions develop themselves, and ripen (so to speak) only with the advancement of reason."

"The pupil is asked if he can verify the reflections of Massillon by the facts of Fenelon; and he answers in the following manner:—Telemachus yielding to pleasure in the island of Cyprus, shews that *pleasure endangers innocence*, and it is the *first thing*; because, on the first occasion in which Telemachus found himself exposed to peril, pleasure was the cause. The *other passions*, &c.—this is seen by Telemachus in the camp of the allies, by Idomeneus," &c.

We will try another experiment. We open a modern work on Political Economy of high reputation, and read, "The general principle that town and country thrive at the expense of each other, I believe to be quite erroneous." The pupil is desired to verify this opinion (unquestionably sound) by a reference to his model-book. He *may*, by patient examination, find some truth from whence he can deduce the soundness of the opinion; but the first thing which will strike him is a passage in the most direct contradiction to it; viz. that in which Mentor and Telemachus converse on the altered state of Salentum. Now, what is to be done? Fenelon knew nothing of Political Economy, and was wrong. Is the pupil to believe him or a less antiquated teacher of the science? And what is to be the strength of his faith in his model-book henceforth? For grammar let him refer perpetually to a model, for a perfect model may be found; but not for style, much less for science, and least of all for morals, should he be confined to one production, be the mind whence it emanates what it may—as pious as Fenelon's, as philosophical as Newton's, or as refined as Michael Angelo's. If we were obliged to choose a model-book, it should be one very unlike *Telemaque*, even in all its original beauty. It should be a very careful selection of Fables, where deep moral and scientific truth should be embodied in the best forms of narrative, and where there might be a union of the beauties of fact, sentiment, and style. But no book could serve the purpose well or permanently but one absolutely divine. We have no fear of any part of the Scriptures being seized upon for the objects of the system; as it is clearly understood from the beginning that the book itself must be sacrificed;—must, from being anatomized, and in that state kept for ever before the eyes of the student, lose not only its entireness and grace, but become recognized only in its mutilated parts, and be regarded with loathing for ever.

We have now considered all that is peculiar to the system of Jacotot; for the modes of interrogation described by Mr. Payne must vary with the varieties of teachers and pupils, and be, moreover, only such as would be practised under any other system of instruction which has any utility in it at all. We will only remark that there are many modes of suggesting and stimulating to inquiry besides mere interrogation; and, knowing how wearisome and irritating the interrogative practice becomes to children, we cannot but hope that all the examinations of Jacotot's school are not conducted by question and answer only, as is the case with those presented in the pamphlet before us. The merit of this far-famed system appears to us to reside in its extensive substitution of the analytical for the synthetical method. The use made of this method in teaching reading, writing, grammar, and all the sciences, we approve as fully as our observation, reflection, and partial experience, authorize us in pronouncing; and we admire the courage with which M. Jacotot has pushed this principle further than it has ever before been systematically carried in the business of education. Of the subordinate parts of his plan we do not think so well, though it is upon these that he and his followers set the highest value. An exclusive attachment to any model-book whatever we consider highly objectionable, and are too well convinced of the injurious effects of the laborious and irksome repetition required in disgusting the learner, and cramping his intellectual powers, to wish to see it adopted for the sake of any possible advantage it may offer in learning a language.

We much doubt whether there be not already a prevalent sameness of thought and style among the compositions of Jacotot's pupils; and whether

among a certain number, faithfully and exclusively educated on his principles, a fair average will arise of independent thinkers,—of men of free intellect, who will do as much for their race as their master has probably done. Fluent writers, cultivated readers, ready-witted speakers, will probably issue from his schools in abundance; but for a higher order of intellect than theirs we shall have, we imagine, to look elsewhere. This system has done much by making its disciples “learn something thoroughly,” which is more than can be said for some other modern systems; and, by doing this, it has opened the way for various and extensive future improvements which were not originally anticipated. Thus it is with all reforms. They do something that was intended; they fall short of much that was intended; and they ultimately effect a vast deal that never was intended. Jacotot's system will initiate many into the analytical process at the beginning instead of the middle part of their course. It will not long or advantageously keep up its practice of repetition, and it will be obliged to limit its rule of reference; but it will suggest new systems which in their turn will have partial success, and be, in due course, improved upon.

As we feel that we have scarcely sanctioned our remarks sufficiently by extracts from the Exposition of the system before us, we proceed, in justice to it and to ourselves, to give a passage in which the principles of Jacotot and the practice of the old school are contrasted with much force and truth:

“It may not be amiss to consider, in the first instance, what is generally meant by the expression—*learning a thing*. To learn any thing is evidently not the same as to forget it; yet we might almost imagine it were, by referring a moment to the common plan pursued in the old method. Will any one maintain that, speaking generally, at the end of his seven years or more of school instruction, he actually recollects one thousandth part of the facts that have been brought before him, or the observations that have been addressed to him, connected with the course of tuition? A considerable portion of all this combined mass of information has remained perfectly unintelligible to him, from the first moment that it was introduced to his notice, to the time at which he throws down his books and enters on the world. He perceived neither the end nor the design of it; and perhaps even the terms in which it was expressed were never thoroughly comprehended, although repeated incessantly in his hearing. In illustration of this it may be asked, Does one child in a hundred *understand* a single page of that book which is put into his hands as soon as he can read, and over which he pores, year after year, and at length by dint of constant repetition, has thoroughly impressed on his memory—the English Grammar?” (An exposure of the incomprehensibility of grammar rules follows.) “The same remarks will apply, more or less, to many others of the generalities which, in the common course of instruction, a pupil is called upon to learn, but which he cannot, from a want of the information previously requisite, understand. Even, however, supposing that he does actually acquire a number of useful facts, they form in his mind an *indigesta moles*, a shapeless mass, in which he perceives neither order nor connexion. He has not been taught by the method of Jacotot to refer every thing learned for the first time to something previously learned; and he cannot, therefore, perceive the relation which the latter bears to the former. But there must necessarily exist a relation. Unless the parts of the book committed to memory had been connected with each other in the mind of the author, he would, of course, have produced a disorderly patchwork of incoherent facts. But this is not the case, at least in any approved work; and if this be not the case, if it was necessary for the author to see clearly the end and aim of all that he proposed to write in order to convey a connected idea of the subject to the reader, it must be equally necessary for the reader, if he wishes to understand the subject as well as the author, to gain possession of

the entire series of facts which compose the subject as presented to his view. This, however, cannot be done, unless the pupil is taught to connect what he learns one day with all that he has learned, relating to the same subject, on every previous day, from the time when it was first urged on his attention. But the facts forgotten cannot, of course, be connected with those remembered; though it is easily seen that, were these supplied, the whole subject would be before the mind. This leads again to the remark previously made, that scarcely a thousandth part of what is learned (using the word in its conventional sense) at school, is retained for use in the actual business of life; though this, most evidently, was the ostensible purpose throughout the entire course.—If the considerations here adduced be thought to have any weight, they must evince one of two things,—either the positive incapacity of pupils of the usual scholastic age to comprehend any subject in the manner referred to, or the defectiveness of the customary method of tuition. It would be impossible, in the face of countless instances in opposition, to maintain the former assertion. If a child can be made to commit to memory and understand one sentence, for instance, there seems no physical obstacle to his doing the same with another, still retaining the first in his memory by constant repetition, and thus connecting the new fact with all that preceded it. This is the method of Jacotot, and he has proved incontestibly both the possibility and effectiveness of such a process.”—As to the fitness of the old systems of education to the purposes for which instruction is valuable—“Two or three facts, from which the inferences requisite to the view now intended may be drawn, are sufficiently obvious to the personal experience of all. After sedulously going through all the manœuvres of instruction for several years, we come from school to begin our education afresh, according to the particular objects which it may be desirable for us to attain in life. We are in possession, indeed, of a vast number of facts, but they lie for the most part unconnectedly and incoherently in the mind. Of a number of others we have a loose and vague notion, just sufficient to admit of consciousness that they exist and have names attached to them, which names we know well, without knowing the things themselves. Still less, however, in these latter fragments of knowledge than in the former do we perceive any sort of coherency or natural connexion: and upon a review of the whole of our acquirements during the long time that we have been employed in making them, the feeling which takes full possession of our mind is, that nine-tenths of all that we learned has been forgotten; that we are well acquainted with no one subject whatever; and that in nearly every point which most concerns us, we are

“Unpractis’d, unprepar’d, and still to seek.

“But, by the system of Jacotot, the faculties of the mind are kept in constant action, from the commencement to the end of the course of instruction; the first acquisitions, as well as all that succeed, are permanently retained, and accordingly every thing learned once is learned for ever.”—Pp. 2–6.

If we ever learn any more languages, we shall be tempted to begin on this system, which seems to us admirably calculated to help such an achievement. Our readers will judge for themselves of the Synopsis of the Method; and as for the introduction to Latin,—the *Epitome Historiæ Sacræ*,—it can scarcely be too highly praised. The style rises from extreme simplicity (through a most ingenious choice of parallel idioms) to a considerable degree of involution; and the pupil is led on insensibly from phrases so inartificial that he cannot mistake them, to paragraphs of easy and even elegant Latinity. This little work, originally compiled by M. L’Homond, Emeritus Professor in the University of Paris, is used as an introduction to the Latin language in nearly all the Jacototian establishments on the continent.—We give the Synopsis of the method of learning a language; and

(by way of specimen of the plan of the work) the first and last sections of the Epitome, by contrasting which the extent of the pupil's progress may be perceived :

" *Make yourself master of some one book written in the language you wish to acquire: that is, commit it to memory—repeat it incessantly—take notice of every sentence, phrase, word, and syllable it contains—study and compare these facts of the language, and analyze them first in the aggregate, then in the detail, so as ultimately to obtain a thorough knowledge of their minutest elements. Refer, by continual reflection, all or any other books in the language to the one you have mastered; that is, compare every sentence, phrase, word, and syllable that you meet with afterwards with those of the book you have learned, and thus make what you know serviceable in interpreting and acquiring what you do not yet know. And, in the last place, verify the observations of others by what you know yourself; that is, read the remarks that have been made on the language as you find them in grammars, books of idioms, dissertations on style, &c. Try or put to the proof the correctness of these remarks, by comparing them with the general observations you have yourself made on the facts that you know: you will thus systematize your knowledge, and ultimately master the language.*"—Epitome, p. vii.

I.

"Deus creāvit cœlum et terram intra sex dies.

Primo die fecit lucem.

Secundo die fecit firmamentum, quod vocavit cœlum.

Tertio die coëgit aquas in unum locum, et eduxit è terrâ plantas et arbôres.

Quarto die fecit solem et lunam, et stellas.

Quinto die, aves quæ volitant in aëre, et pisces qui natant in aquis.

Sexto die fecit omnia animantia, postrēmò hominem, et quiēvit die septimo."—Epitome, pp. 2, 3.

CXCH.

"Mortuo Aristobulo, Alexander ejus filius regnavit: is nullâ re memorabili gestâ decessit: duos reliquit filios, qui acriter de regno inter se decertarunt.

Hujus dissidii occasione, Pompeius, populi Români dux, in Judæam venit, specie quidem restituendæ inter fratres concordiæ, revērâ ut istam provinciam Romano adjungēret imperio: Judæam stipendiariam populi Romani fecit.

Paulò post regnum Judæa invasit Herôdes alienigena: hunc primum Judæi habuerunt regem et aliâ gente ortum, eoque regnante natus est Christus, uti prædixerant prophetæ."

Epitome, pp. 124, 125.

I.

"God created the heaven and the earth within six days.

On the first day he made light.

On the second day he made the firmament, which he called heaven.

On the third day he brought the waters together into one place, and drew out of the earth plants and trees.

On the fourth day he made the sun, and the moon, and the stars.

On the fifth day he made the birds which fly about in the air, and the fishes which swim in the waters.

On the sixth day he made all living creatures, lastly man, and rested on the seventh day.

192.

"After the death of Aristobulus, his son Alexander reigned. He died without performing any distinguished action, and left two sons, who contended most obstinately for the possession of the kingdom.

Pompey, the general of the Roman people, availing himself of this dissension, came into Judæa, under pretext of restoring concord between the brothers, but in reality with the design of attaching that province to the Roman empire; he rendered Judæa tributary to the Roman people.

A short time after, the kingdom of Judæa was seized by Herod, a foreigner. He was the first king of another nation that ruled over the Jews; and in his reign Jesus Christ was born, as the prophets had foretold.

LETTERS FROM GERMANY.

No. IX.

SIR,

Heidelberg.

SCHELLING'S philosophy first brought into repute those metaphysico-religious speculations which have received the name of religious philosophy. His doctrines had revived the belief that philosophy would be carried at length to its perfection, by conceiving of the natural world as existing only in the Divine Being. The author may not have intended at first to lay a foundation for Pantheism; but his system inclosed seeds which could not fail to be quickened into religious sophisms of that kind under favouring circumstances. Many speculatists of the same class have come out of his school, without assuming, however, the name of religious philosophers. The most remarkable fact is, that a class of religious mystics, both of Catholics and Protestants, have assumed that name, and affect to take Schelling's doctrine into alliance with their own religious mysticism, in order to give it an imposing and philosophical front. All, hating in their heart the Protestant principle of the right of private judgment, in their object, and the means of accomplishing it, coalesce with Jesuitism. They would build up an absolute church authority, Protestant or Catholic, and they make war upon all philosophy, and that of their assumed patron Schelling as much as the rest, where it cannot be made available to their design. This is nothing less than to restore the darkness of the middle ages. It professes to be a restoration of philosophy through religion. The extermination of science, through an alliance, defensive and offensive, between intolerance and mysticism, would describe it more justly. The ark of science must be carried off from Pagan hands, and then sunk in oblivion for ever. The design has been exposed in a recent publication by Dr. C. Seebold, (occasioned by a mystical lecture delivered at the opening of the University at Munich,) remarkable for clearness and vigour of expression. It is entitled, "Philosophy and Religious Philosophers." Connected with the particular object, it contains many passages of great general interest. I shall condense a part of what respects natural morality and religion; the spirit and design of Christianity; and its speedy obscuration after the first age of the church.

"Christianity is a purely religious doctrine. It consists solely and entirely of religious truth. Philosophy and science are foreign to its design. In the Christian Scriptures there is nothing of a scientific tendency. On the contrary, they shew what is very remote from the spirit of philosophical inquiry, a disposition to abstract contemplation, and faith in supernatural influences. After the lapse of the two first centuries, when Christianity had spread through the different nations of antiquity, and was now brought into contact and correspondence with their philosophical views, a remarkable agitation arose in the Christian world, which threatened the community of Christians hitherto united among themselves with intestine divisions. A number of conflicting parties appeared, each striving to give a philosophical structure to Christianity. The Christian faith, which had shewn till now that it contained a principle of union, and which still shewed it in what was purely religious, lost this virtue when it was invaded by the sophisms of a foreign philosophy. It included within itself no philosophical doctrine which, by its absolute authority, could impose peace on conflicting opinions. Disputes multiplied, the strife was extended without limit, and it issued in violent divisions. The entire history of the church presents a series of such pic-

tures. It is remarkable that these disputes were produced much less through the old religious rites of the new converts, than through the different philosophical views which they brought along with them. Against strange religions Christianity displayed a victorious power; it had no forces to bring into the field when it was forced to mingle in the fray of philosophical systems, because its original and essential character was that of a pure religion, and no philosophical doctrine was in its elements. The fathers of the church, combining the doctrines of their schools with the facts of Christianity, formed a sort of Christian philosophy. Many of them had been educated among the Greeks, and had embraced the new Platonic philosophy. Antiquity, with its literature, was at their side. It was necessary to defend Christianity against the attacks of the learned, and, unfortunately, they judged it a useful policy to arm themselves out of the magazine of the pagan philosophy. For this purpose the doctrines or the terms of New-platonism were transplanted into Christian ground. Thus the boundaries of the church may have been enlarged, but this was not the way to preserve peace within its walls. With the attempt to expound the simple Christian faith into a doctrinal system arose new conflicts. And how could it be otherwise? In Christianity itself there was no philosophical doctrine which could prescribe the rule, or prevent the application of the new philosophy. To supply the supposed want, the dogma of church unity was assumed. This must be maintained by the decisions of councils convoked for the purpose: church authority must be consolidated, and the foundation was laid of that Roman Catholic Church which was to bind in fetters of iron for centuries both philosophy and Christianity. The supposed necessity of defending the Christian faith by philosophical reasonings, had now ceased to exist. The pagan world was converted, and the building of the church stood firm. The last remains of ancient science gradually disappeared; the spirit of philosophical speculation was departed; even in the theological school of Alexandria it was no more. The better part of the popes and ecclesiastics offered some opposition to the prevailing darkness; but without effect. Even Charlemagne was able to preserve a trembling light but for a short time. New articles were added to the public creed, and all now rested securely, but separately, on the traditions of the church, when John Damascenus, with the help of the Aristotelian philosophy, constructed them into one system."—"The oldest religions were theocratical. Under their authority the rude inhabitants of the earth were composed into social states, and their natural ferocity was made to bend to the necessary conditions of peace and good order. Accordingly, the laws of morality and of religion and civil ordinances were bound together in one code, and the commandment which enjoined a moral duty was coupled with precepts that respected cleanliness and diet. This mixture of laws gave to these religions and their priests great influence over the people. But it was impossible that they should not prepare an easy entrance for many positive ordinances which would ultimately usurp the place of moral duties. Christianity removed the whole leaven; religion was purified from the earthly mixture; and morality began to blossom and put forth its fruits and authenticate the faith that bore them. But the purity of Christian doctrine was not to be of long duration. It was soon filled with dogmas and loaded with precepts, like the ancient religions of the priesthood. The ecclesiastics coveted power, and would that their religion should be all in all. The moral religion must retreat; and instead of the command of duty, the prescription of the church must be obeyed. The belief that moral instruction had no other basis than the doctrines of their church was

more and more confirmed; and as the teachers were, and still are, in most cases the only teachers of morality, the belief became universal, and has kept its ground to the present day. God is indeed acknowledged to be the supreme moral legislator, but it is not inquired whether his commandments are given to us through the statutory law of the church, or in a very different way."—"The religion of Christ contains not only the purest, but also the briefest morality. It is that of nature; it accords with the dictates of our hearts, and lays upon us no yoke of doubtful tests. The commandment of Christian morality is the simple expression of the voice of virtue within us. No mystic discipline, no wonderful expedients, through which secret effects will be accomplished. It delineates no entire system of moral instruction; it delivers no complete code of moral duties; but it commands love, the love of goodness. Thou shalt do good, not for the sake of reward or praise, but from love to virtue. This is the universal commandment, that of the virtuous purpose, rising out of the pure heart, and this comprehends within it every particular case of duty. Let every man know of himself what is right. Let every man use his best moral judgment, and act upon it, that his deeds may proceed from a pure motive, and obey the commandment of a pure heart. But how did Christianity teach this virtue of a holy self-determination? It taught it not as a revelation from heaven, but as a revelation of the human heart; and to prepare itself a way it stept forward to men become obtuse in merely formal practices, and awakened their power of attention to the voice of virtue within them, that they might be fitted to receive the divine revelation: 'Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' 'Religion, as a teacher of morality, places itself upon the ground of human conscience, professes to teach nothing new, nothing unascertained before, nothing of which man can be put in possession only through a higher revelation. But it calls upon barbarous and unthinking man to hear and acknowledge the voice of his own heart. Christianity delivers no system of moral duties, but it teaches moral purity. It founds not a new moral code, but a new moral condition. The commandment to be pure in heart expresses no particular law; it respects only the virtuous determination, when man submits himself to the laws of virtue, and the purpose is virtuous even when the law is mistaken. The will, considered not so properly a power in man, as the man himself determining his own actions, the use of his own powers, lays a ground on which human virtue can be built. His moral strength is measured by the intensity with which he determines his powers on the side of virtue.'"^{*}—"What is that within our breasts through which we are more than a mere mirror of the material world without us, more than mere automations, led by blind impulses, the source of joy and sorrow, of love and hatred, of admiration and enthusiasm? What is this logos of the life of man, which breathes a soul into action, which gives sanctity to law, and carries a high and spiritual feeling even into inanimate nature? It is the consciousness of our own nature, of our capacity and destination. It is that moral feeling which is not to be defined, explained, and brought under a formula, which is only to be quickened and invigorated. Here the under-

* The divines and moralists of Germany, without denying the antecedent certainty of human actions, consider the freedom of the will as the proper element of all moral agency. They say that a moral world can no more be conceived to exist without it, than the natural world without time and space; that the determinations of a moral agent do not fall within the laws under which we conceive of the determinations of physical forces. Leibnitz, Hemsterhuis, and Kant, three great names, successively threw the weight of their conviction and authority on this side.

standing does but hold the scales, the heart throws in the weight. It is this, which, when oppressed with the burthen of an earthly condition, casts itself upon the idea of perfection hereafter far beyond the limits of that oppression. High above all that is terrestrial, the spirit soars victorious and triumphant. Subjected here to the powers of material nature, it bears under their fostering influence a short-lived blossom, and is soon withdrawn from the agitations of sense. This is the basis of natural religion, that revelation within us through which we are conscious of our proper nature."—"He who should not shrink back alarmed from the imputation of prejudice, which of all scandals is the worst, would not long deny the existence of feelings and dispositions *à priori* in our nature. At present this form of expression has to encounter objections, which will disappear with time. There is still in philosophy a strong prejudice against all that is called feeling, because abuses have been linked with the word. Speak of feeling, and men think of some transient impression, some paroxysm of weakness, or of some fond manner of thinking, without acuteness, and unsupported by reason. And yet it is an acknowledged fact, that there are cases in which, to refuse the evidence of feeling, is to reject all means of information and conviction. There are lofty and intransitory feelings, independent of passion, humour, and the excitements of sense, which give intelligence of things to which the ideas of sense, and the understanding employed upon them, can furnish nothing more than the clothing. All truths which reason contemplates stand before it as ideas or representations, and thus first they become objects of thought. But this is not the form in which all are originally given. There are truths which are the offspring of the heart, and owe their arrangement only to the head. A merely good head has never known how to speak, and yet less how to act in what regards the end of human life and man's final destination. Through the suggestions of a natural religion, the mind of man aspires to a region of greater spiritual freedom above this world of sense; but wanting a certain object, it endeavours to sustain its hope by images which are very dissimilar according to the degrees of intellect and cultivation in different tribes and persons. To deliver it from this state of visionary expectation or doubt, revelation descends to its succour. The announcement of a heavenly kingdom, the invitation to the full assurance of hope, the commandment to be pure in heart, that we may be qualified to inherit the promise; these are the glad tidings of the Christian revelation, and thus it is 'the anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast.'"

I subjoin the substance of some theological passages on the same subject from the lectures of Knapp, who was certainly no rationalist:

"It is an undoubted fact, that we men could be better than we are, and every man must confess it of himself. The possibility of continual moral improvement suggests the belief, that there is in the nature of man a capacity of being raised to moral perfection; and from the capacity we infer the destination; as we see in the seed that it is intended to be developed into a plant. The true destination of man as a rational being is, continually increasing moral perfection, or in the language of Scripture, holiness; and happiness connected with it, and in the same degrees. But if man has been ordained by God to such an end, he must have the power to attain it; and since he does not possess it of himself, God must have provided the means by the use of which he will become continually better; for it is impossible that God has designed man for that, which for him is unattainable. The power must be sought, and can be found only in religion, that is, in the sense of our relation to God, or faith in God as our supreme ruler, law-

giver, and judge. The knowledge of God, of his moral government and will, is to be obtained either from nature, as in the pagan world, or through immediate revelation from God. Hence the distinction of religion into natural and revealed, a distinction which is made by Paul, Rom. ii. 14, who names the divine revelation, the law, and describes those who wanted it as not having the law, but being a law, a natural revelation, to themselves.—Though the religion of nature, in its greatest perfection, (which few, however, have the means and power to attain,) leads man to very valuable conclusions; yet when he begins to feel his wants aright, it leaves him in anxious doubt on several all-important points, and yields not the full power which is necessary to his moral improvement and perfection. The elder Pliny said of his own and of former times, that mankind were still very much in the dark on the subject of religion.—(Hist. Nat. III. 1, *Ad religionem maxime etiamnum caligat humanum genus.*) Hence it might be expected that God would supply this want of man by a special revelation; but the fact must be established on sure historical evidence. It can never be demonstrated *à priori*, that no such revelation has been given, or that such a revelation is impossible. Let the fact be well attested, and reason has nothing to shew against it. Christians find a history of true revelations in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. (The theological student is here referred to Janis' answer to the question, whether a universal pure religion of reason is possible in this world, and whether a new formation or an abrogation of the Christian religion is to be expected?) The genuine and pure religion of nature can never contradict that of revelation; and when such a contradiction is found to exist, it is a decisive proof that the supposed revealed religion is not a divine revelation, for God cannot reveal himself to man in one light in nature, and in a contrary light in a special revelation. The Scriptures also commend the knowledge of God, deduced from nature, and speak of it reverentially. In the 19th Psalm the first six verses respect the knowledge of God through nature, the remaining verses that of revelation. See Acts xiv. 17; Rom. i. 19, ii. 12. Some theologians have rejected the distinction of natural and revealed religion, as F. Socinus, Ferguson, Gruner, and others. They maintain, that man owes all his knowledge of God to a revelation which was first made to him in Paradise, and was delivered down from thence, and diffused among mankind. It does indeed appear from the Scriptures, that revelations were made to man in the earliest age of the world, and much of the knowledge thus imparted descended, no doubt, to his posterity. Yet the distinction is just; for some of the truths of revelation are also demonstrable by reason, and, in fact, have been known through the light of nature. Thus the Apostle says of the Gentiles, that which may be known of God, the knowledge of God (*το γνωστον for γνωσις*) is manifest to them (*εν αυτοις for αυτοις*), for God has revealed it to them: He has given them the means of obtaining this knowledge naturally," &c., &c.

J. M.

THE CONVERSATIONS OF EBION ADAMSON AND HIS FRIENDS.

No. II.

Present—Ebion Adamson, Barnabas, Elhanan, and Caleb.

BARNABAS.

How death is impoverishing the churches ! Andrew Thomson and Robert Hall both gone ! The Presbyterians of Scotland and the Baptists of England will be long ere they replace such men.

EBION ADAMSON.

Thomson was essentially a Presbyterian ; Hall was only accidentally a Baptist. The one wrote but little that did not indicate the sect to which he belonged ; and the other as little that did.

ELHANAN.

The difference was not altogether in the men. Presbyterianism, at least Scotch Presbyterianism, is a complete system. It has power over head, heart, and life. It regulates faith and practice. It forms character. The advocacy of baptism may be connected with a hundred different systems.

EBION ADAMSON.

And therefore baptism does not serve well either to unite those who hold its obligation, or to distinguish them from other Christians.

CALEB.

It discriminates as much as the term Presbyterian does in England.

EBION ADAMSON.

About as much. The one tells you that you are admitted into the church by a certain ceremony ; and the other tells you that there is no church to be admitted into, either with or without ceremony.

CALEB.

'Twere better if there were. We might profitably copy some of the discipline of the popular sects.

EBION ADAMSON.

Let us wait till the problem is solved of rendering that discipline efficient without the meddling, vexation, and petty tyranny, that are its usual concomitants.

BARNABAS.

Though very decided on the baptismal question, Robert Hall was always the champion of free communion.

EBION ADAMSON.

He was no sectarian. He could not be made the tool of a party ; and he had too strong a perception of its defects to make himself its head. His antipathies were always much keener than his sympathies. His most celebrated bursts of eloquence are all of a vituperative cast. His Letters on the Freedom of the Press, his Sermon on Modern Infidelity, and that on the Sentiments proper to the then present Crisis, (to say nothing of his reviews,) are full of even fierce attack.

BARNABAS.

Is not this merely saying that he was eloquent ? Southey, in one of his Quarterly articles, has endeavoured to shew that the Pulpit can never rival the oratory of the Bar, the Senate, or the Tribune, because it allows not of those appeals to the violent passions by which they produce so much effect.

EBION ADAMSON.

There is a false implication. Benevolence may be as eloquent as malignity. Nor was Hall malignant, though he was vituperative. He was only under the strong excitement of an indignant benevolence. "The light that led astray was light from heaven."

BARNABAS.

And his most vehement passages are generally founded on Christian principles.

EBION ADAMSON.

They are; and always full of beauty even when most terrible. His style is the perfection of purity and grace. The thought may sometimes be extravagant, but the expression is never turgid.

CALEB.

Dr. Thomson was by far the most influential man.

EBION ADAMSON.

That depends upon the time at which the account is cast up. A later date may shew a different balance. Dr. Thomson was powerful in the pulpit and the assembly. He was a sound Presbyterian, and he made sound Presbyterians. He was an acute debater, a thorough-going partizan, a formidable polemic, and, what was far better, a very faithful and diligent pastor of his flock, in which capacity let us hope Providence blessed his labours, so that he saved the souls of his hearers as well as his own. But his mind and character were altogether of a coarser mould than those of Robert Hall. *His* fame will belong not merely to the Baptists, or to Britain, but to the world. His eloquence will charm and influence in lands where Presbyteries are unknown, and in ages when they shall be forgotten.

BARNABAS.

Let us forget their failings, and honour their memories, and follow them so far as they followed their Master.

ELHANAN.

Robert Hall should have lived a little longer. He was amongst the early champions of Parliamentary Reform.

CALEB.

Yes, and of a broader reform than Lord John Russell proposes. But we may as well, perhaps, not discuss his political consistency.

EBION ADAMSON.

It was something that he was a politician at all. Politics are the morals of a nation, and it is better to err sometimes than to have no conscience.

ELHANAN.

You consider Reform then as a sort of national conversion.

EBION ADAMSON.

Exactly. And the people, like the awakened sinner, in the common theology, cannot reform themselves. They can only pray for the change; and that they have done most lustily.

BARNABAS.

May it do them all the good they expect!

EBION ADAMSON.

Ultimately it will do them a great deal more. At present their chief wish is to have a more direct influence over the legislature in order to lighten the

burden of taxation. The Reform Bill, by which Ministers have nobly redeemed their pledges, and earned the hearty support of all good men, will give them that. The House will not be identified with the public, but the public will be, or at least may be, the strongest party in it.

BARNABAS.

And ultimately ?

EBION ADAMSON.

Their intelligence will be extended, and their prejudices corrected. The Bill might have been called, A Bill for Amending the National Character.

BARNABAS.

But will not elections still be scenes of disorder ? Will not votes still be influenced by corrupt motives ?

EBION ADAMSON.

No doubt. For a while they will be bad enough ; and we shall probably be driven to the ballot at last. But the influence which sustained itself upon the ignorance and degradation of the people will sink under the defeat it has experienced. On the hustings, in the House, and through the press, men of talent and principle will have stronger motives and larger opportunities for conveying sound instruction to the public mind. The taxes on knowledge, as they have been very properly called, must be promptly and totally repealed.

ELHANAN.

As they ought to be. The press, like every thing else in this country, is a monopoly. Capitalists speculate in opinions. They watch the market. They send forth the arguments for which there is a demand, and which will bring the largest returns.

EBION ADAMSON.

The newspaper press, you mean. Ministers must double their proposed reduction of the stamp duty, at least. We may then hope to rival the French papers. They surpass us shamefully now.

CALEB.

The wonderful power of our periodical press might certainly be turned to better account.

EBION ADAMSON.

It must. Scarcely any moral or even intellectual use has yet been made by us of this great machinery. Political and commercial intelligence, and mere amusement, are the chief objects aimed at. All professions, all sects, all parties, ought to have, not only their quarterly or monthly, but their weekly or daily organ. Every man who has discoveries to communicate, or principles to inculcate, ought to have facilities for doing so, without being liable to a tax which acts as a prohibition on all who cannot risk hundreds or thousands of pounds.

CALEB.

A scheme for a Morning Paper knocked up the other day because not more than from fifteen to twenty thousand pounds was subscribed ; and that was not capital enough to make the experiment.

BARNABAS.

Monstrous ! But do the different bodies of religionists wish for newspapers of their own ?

EBION ADAMSON.

At least in one way ; just as the Church wished for schools when it was

found that schools there must be ; and Bell was set up because Lancaster could not be put down. As their people must have the article, their leaders would rather have the providing of it themselves.

BARNABAS.

And what is the precise good to be accomplished by this multiplication of newspapers ?

EBION ADAMSON.

The promotion of knowledge ; and in the long run, and no very long run either, knowledge is virtue.

BARNABAS.

"I see the right and yet the wrong pursue."

EBION ADAMSON:

A false fact. Those who pursue the wrong have no sight, scarcely an owl's blink of the right.

CALEB.

Do not many of the boroughmongers "see the right" of the people to be represented, and yet "pursue the wrong" of making the nomination of representatives their own private property ?

EBION ADAMSON.

Yes ; that is the owl's blink I spoke of ; but if their vision were clearer, they would see the real right of the case beyond that ; they would perceive that the relinquishment of their usurpation and robbery would not only do good to others, but to themselves ; would make them better and happier men all their lives, and give them experience of the principle that "true self-love and social are the same."

ELHANAN.

You are just come round to your favourite definition, that virtue is the means of happiness.

EBION ADAMSON.

Which is the first principle of my moral science. If the preachers and teachers of "right" had adhered to it, there would have been much less talk about knowing the right and doing the wrong than there has been.

BARNABAS.

But will not the flesh always strive against the spirit ?

EBION ADAMSON.

Not so very much, when the spirit knows what it is about. The flesh has no objection to happiness, and will trust the spirit's guidance when the spirit proves itself to be trustworthy.

BARNABAS.

Your language would shock the original sinners.

EBION ADAMSON.

Not more than theirs would shock me, had I not given over being shocked. What can be more preposterous than the question once put to a student in an orthodox college by a visiting minister, "whether he was willing to be eternally damned for the divine glory ?"

ELHANAN.

Many of the American divines, such as Hopkins and Bellamy, would, I suppose, have answered in the affirmative without hesitation.

EBION ADAMSON.

The absurdity grows out of a departure from my definition, as you call it.

When virtue and heaven are both made *positive*, there is no end to the confusion, and I may add the vice and misery too, which must result. Let mankind see the way of happiness clearly, and immorality will be reduced to its minimum.

BARNABAS.

And for that they must be enlightened by newspapers?

EBION ADAMSON.

The pulpit was a new power happily adapted to an age which had no other means of communication than conversation and manuscripts. Christianity has used that power well. It is now eclipsed by the greater power of a cheap and rapid press. Why should not Christianity use that too?

ELHANAN.

But the pulpit is yet powerful. Men must always be more impressible in masses than solitarily; and on moral subjects more impressible after a social religious service, than when abstracted from the associations of the house of prayer.

EBION ADAMSON.

Certainly; and therefore let the power of the pulpit be still directed, and with energy, to the promotion of goodness and happiness. But its appropriate work now, is that which you have described; it is *impression*; the press is the fitter power for enlightening and convincing the intellect.

BARNABAS.

But on any plan a newspaper must always have much in it that is not strictly religious.

EBION ADAMSON.

There is nothing in the universe which is not strictly religious. Whatever isolates itself is only superstition. All sciences are doctrine; all industry is worship; all laws of matter and of mind are God's will; all results of those laws are God's works; and all devotion, goodness, and happiness, have their best and broadest basis in the truth, that "of him, and through him, and to him, are all things."

CRITICAL NOTICES.

THEOLOGY.

ART. I.—*The Second Volume of Sermons.* By the Rev. J. Buckminster (late of Boston, U. S.). Reprinted from the American edition. London. 1831.

THE name of Buckminster, and the circumstances of his life and early death, are too well known to render it necessary for us to advocate the claims of any of his writings to notice and admiration. This work will add to his high reputation, since the discourses it contains,

though the subjects of a second selection from his MSS. are, in our opinion, superior to the first set. They are quite as vigorous, as rich, as imaginative, without being exuberant in style; in the more important qualities of truth and devotional earnestness, they cannot, of course, be inferior. Many who might have begun to suspect, like ourselves, that their attachment to the former volume partly depended on early pleasurable association with its animated and poetical style, will find that behind these

embellishments there is a solid structure of truth and piety. These discourses must have been peculiarly effective in the delivery, for we know none which more powerfully suggest the manner and even the voice of the preacher. The suggestion seems so like an act of memory, that it is scarcely possible to believe that the voice of the preacher was silent in death before his appeals reached our land. This affords a proof of the fitness of these sermons for being read as well as heard. As an illustration, take the following extract from a discourse on Providence.

"To shew you how little our lot in the world has been in our own hands, it is not necessary to carry you back to those hours when you were waiting for life, and the little spark of existence, just kindled, was trembling under every passing breath of casualty. It is not necessary to dwell upon the days of your infancy, when it was every minute doubtful whether the being that had been introduced into life would live long enough to understand that he had a life to preserve. We will pass over those days of boyhood when the understanding is not ripe enough to form plans, and when the forethought, just appearing, extends no further than to the pleasures, hardly to the evils, of the morrow. We will pass over too the remaining years of minority, when the imagination just begins to know its own alacrity, and, fertile in youthful projects, leaps forward from one year to another of a life, long in prospect, touching every object it meets with the tints of hope. The whole of this early period, though it often gives a lasting colour to the remainder of life, is so little within our own power, and is so seldom influenced by any plans which we are then capable of forming, that it would be superfluous to insist longer upon the conclusion we would draw from it. There is a time, however, when every man begins to feel something of his own self-sufficiency, when we choose the pursuits we mean to follow, mark out what we imagine to be the road to happiness, and thus prepared, enter on the wide and busy scene of active life. From this period, then, when you think you have taken the thread of your fortunes into your own hands, allow me to follow you a few steps. The first fact which shews us how little our present situation is the result of our own arrangements, is the innumerable defeats every man's plans encounter. I appeal to any one who has lived long in the world, whether, at any period of his life,

he has found himself in the precise circumstances he expected. This certainty of disappointment arises from more than one source. In the first place, so various and complicated are human interests, so inordinate are many of our desires, and so unreasonable are others, that two individuals can hardly form extensive plans of conduct which shall not interfere, if not by direct collision, at least in some subordinate parts, so as to affect the issue of the whole. What a range of disappointment does this single fact open! The success of one half the human race is the partial disappointment of the other. From this single source of disappointment, however real or imaginary—the contrariety of human interests—you see how much of your destiny on earth is placed at once out of your own controul. It would be impossible to enumerate all the causes of the failure of our plans. One, however, which more perhaps than any other shews the folly of far-extended projects, is the uncertainty of health, a blessing which is attended with no perceptible sensation of pleasure, but which is indispensable to the full enjoyment of every other pleasure. And is this a good which is within the reach of human foresight? I ask you, young man, who have been forming extensive plans of future eminence, you who are so busy while the worm of disease is secretly feeding at the seat of life, and sucking the bloom of health from your cheek. I ask you, laborious man of business, whose plans have attained all the excellence which maturity of mind, long experience, and increasing confidence, can give them, have you never felt pains which warn you of your mortality? Have you never laid your head upon the pillow with a foreboding that to-morrow might sweep you and your projects into oblivion? What then? Is man the arbiter of his own fate, when the least mite that floats in God's air may derange the whole system of the human constitution? Is man the being to forget that his lot is not within his own disposal, when the first breeze may waft pestilence to his heart, and the first exhalation which rises up under his nostrils may poison the source of his being; and, if he recover, leave him a life of debility, of inactivity, perhaps of pain and misery? Go to the tomb-stones, and read there the record of human disappointments. The heads which are now mouldering in those narrow cells once teemed with plans as probable as yours."

—Pp. 18—21.

This extract, as it is merely a philosophical sketch of one department of the experience of human life, is not a fair specimen of the spirit of the volume. It is merely quoted for the excellence of its pulpit style. Every discourse in the collection exhibits the fervour of the author's Christian piety and charity. To the work itself, therefore, we refer our readers.

ART. II.—*Elements of Religion and Morality: in the form of a Catechism.* By W. E. Channing, D. D. London: John Mardon. 1831.

EXPERIENCE has led us to doubt whether religious instruction by question and answer is ever acceptable or serviceable to children: but if any work could reconcile us to the catechetical method, it would be the one before us. By many answers being given to one question, the pernicious association of mere sound is avoided, and the child is obliged to think before he can answer any way but straight forwards. It is nearly impossible to help making such a work too abstract for little minds; but the present is perhaps as interesting as its plan will allow.

ART. III.—*Examen de la Doctrine des Ecritures, touchant la Personne de Jésus Christ, la Rédemption, et le Pêché Originel; suivi d'une Dissertation sur la Religion Naturelle.* Par Jean André de Luc, Auteur de l'Histoire du Passage des Alpes. Genève, 1830.

Our readers will be pleased to find that books of English Unitarianism are attracting the attention of the Genevese; nay, more than this, that a spirit of free inquiry into the several doctrines of Christianity is animating the inhabitants of the interesting cantons of Switzerland; and that promise is afforded ere long of the most decided and acknowledged adoption of the primitive religion of Jesus. We know that the Genevese have, for a considerable period, perceived the light; but the acknowledgment of it, in spite of all opposition, is perhaps that in which they have been deficient. M. De Luc presents a bolder and more determined character. Mr. Belsham's *Calm Enquiry* is frequently referred to in this volume. His consistent scheme of Unitarianism is that which is here advocated. It will be unnecessary to enter into the *minutiae*, with which our readers are well acquainted. We shall content

ourselves with informing them that a few copies of the above work have been imported by the Unitarian Association, who have agreed to insert this interesting contribution to continental Unitarianism in their catalogue for the present year. We extract the following paragraph relating to a text, the precise nature of which is at present a matter of discussion:

“On sait que le mot *Dieu* ne se trouve point dans les manuscrits les plus anciens et les plus approuvés, ni dans aucune version de quelque réputation. Ce mot n'est cité non plus par aucun des premiers écrivains Grec, ni par aucun écrivain Latin. Mais ce qui est un argument décisif, c'est que, dans la controverse Arienne, avant le sixième siècle, on n'a jamais cité ce mot comme une autorité, et ce ne fut qu'à cette époque qu'on dit que le mot *Dieu* fut introduit dans les copies Grecques, par Macédonius, évêque de Constantinople.” —P. 123.

The following note is subjoined:

“Cet historique est tiré de l'ouvrage de Th. Belsham sur la personne de Jésus Christ. Je l'avais communiqué à M. Gaussen, mais il n'en a tenu aucun compte, comme on peut le voir dans sa lettre.” —Pp. 57, 68, 72.

ART. IV.—*De la Religion Saint-Simonienne.* Aux Elèves de l'Ecole Polytechnique. Cinq Discours, &c. Paris. 1830.

THE extended notices which have already appeared in our periodical on the subject of the St. Simonite faith preclude the necessity of any analysis of the pamphlet before us. It contains five lectures, addressed to the pupils of the Polytechnique School, on the subjects of Religion, Deity, Humanity, Heritage, and an Appeal to those whose attention is awakened to the system on their duties to humanity.

Deep as is our interest in all these subjects, and in the mode in which they are treated of here, it is with the last that we have most to do. Of all the responsibilities which attach to those who have influence in society, none, perhaps, is at present more serious than that which arises from an observation of this new sect. In sober seriousness we believe that nothing has occurred since the Reformation in which the interests of Christianity, that is, of humanity, have been so deeply involved as in the development of this new doctrine; and it is

time that every adherent of revelation should consider and make up his mind as to what part he is to take in the moral revolution which is spreading abroad, and which he is bound to oppose or aid.

We have taken our part, judging of the system from the statements put forth by those who understand it best. Nothing is easier than to separate the enthusiasm from the rationale of the case; the partisanship from the sound convictions of its advocates; their religious errors (too natural to be startling) from the fundamental piety, which is perhaps even more evident to us than to those who build upon it a structure which Christianity itself will hasten to consecrate. It is nothing to us (in this view) what St. Simon was; we are concerned only with the results of his labours. It matters little that some of his followers expect too soon the full operation of their principles; we have to do only with the principles themselves. Our dissent from the St. Simonite opinions of the essence of Deity and the scope of Christianity, is not a sufficient reason for our rejection of the entire system, especially if we can account (as we clearly can) for the distortion of their principles in these particular applications. Such partial dissent, on the contrary, engages our exertions on their behalf, and impels us to point out to them where we believe them to have found their sound principles, and what has caused them to perpetuate the few enormous errors from which their system will soon, we trust, work itself free. We wish we had as firm a faith that the great body of Christians would speedily learn to refer the details of their religion to its principles, as we have that the true St. Simonites will soon, through Christ, worship the Father in spirit and in truth. It is because Christians have thus forsaken principles for details that this sect has learned to conceive of a "*Nouveau Christianisme*." Witness the following description (which we translate) of the "direction of the exertions of the Christian Church," the only Christian Church whose proceedings have been known to the St. Simonites:

"God being a pure spirit, all attainment of perfection, in a material order of beings, was judged to be of an essentially inferior nature.

"The principle of evil having matter for its domain, the accession of material enjoyments was not only declared subordinate: it was censured.

"Sorrow being the just punishment of an anterior crime, man accepted evil, and submitted to it with resignation,

perhaps with joy, instead of recognizing in it a perpetual indication of progress to be made, in order to reach a better state by his own deserts.

"The church perfected sentiments, and developed sympathies, for its God was a God of love. The church had *priests*.

"The church also proposed to cultivate science; but exclusively with relation to the phenomena of mind. It had *theologians* who studied man in his *intellectual* faculties, and in his relations to God and humanity as a *spiritual* being.

"In these two departments, the church has rendered immense services to the world; but has never pursued the perfection of the *material* welfare of humanity; at least in a *direct* and *consistent* manner. Thus, for instance, no special ecclesiastical body has ever been organized whose office should be to stimulate or accomplish advancement in this direction. Such an institution would have been too absolutely opposed to the constitution of its faith; and the impotence of the attempts that the society of Jesuits has made in this department confirms all our observations," &c., &c.—P. 17.

To whom belongs the shame that this should be given in all simplicity as a description of the social influence of the Christian Church? How happens it that in the first page of this pamphlet we meet in a note with a kind of apology for conciliating the prejudices of the hearers in favour of a religion which, to the St. Simonites, has become a matter of "secondary concern"? Compare this apology with the grand Christian principles which are afterwards advocated, and see whether superstition or Christianity is really the matter of "secondary concern." If afraid that enthusiasm may mingle with an anticipation of the future, as sketched out by these philosophers, look steadily into the principles on which they conduct their retrospect into history, and judge from this survey whether or not they are qualified to assume the offices of preachers and philanthropists. The greater part of this historical survey has compelled our delighted assent to its deductions, and cheered us with the hope that, ere long, a survey of revelation will lead our foreign brethren to conclusions as true, and convictions yet more genial than those at which they have already arrived.

True Christians and true St. Simonites are own brothers, separated by the present conditions of their being, but destined to meet, with an acknowledgment

of kindred on their lips. In the mean time, let the beam and the mote be cast out, that together they may clearly discern the things of the spirit, which it is their equal desire to understand.

GENERAL LITERATURE.

ART. V.—*German Poetical Anthology, preceded by a concise History of German Poetry, and Short Notices of the Authors selected* By A. Bernays. Second edition, improved. London. 1831.

WHAT is prettier to the eye than clear German text on good English paper? What is more attractive to the imagination than such groups of names as we here meet with at every page,—names which, all inharmonious as they may be, waken music in the soul of the true lover of poetry? What can be more luxurious than to have all truth and beauty presented to us in the unpretending form of an Anthology?

We speak not of Anthologies in general. We never saw a collection of Beauties in our own language, or in any other but German, that we could interest ourselves in for half an hour at a time: but German minor pieces are unlike all others. If the principle be ever illustrated that “all is in all,” it is in those mysterious compositions in which, under the appearance of a well-defined single form, manifold essences are concentrated—essences which change their aspect perpetually, as if the conceptions themselves were alive and stirring before the perceptive power. Thus Göthe brings all earthly life within the compass of fewer thoughts than serve some men in descanting on their mistress’s eyebrow. Thus Schiller suggests all heaven by slight references to whatever may have happened to meet his eye, or recur to his memory, in the moments of his “high visitation.” The fact is, we suppose, that we except German from other Anthologies, because most of its component parts are *not* morsels, are *not* minor poems, but as great as any number of volumes could make them, as important as any preluding invocation could intimate. Where is the philosopher who can teach more of the intellect than the *Die Ideale* of Schiller? What can all the St. Simonites in all France propound on the fine arts that is not already concentrated in the *Die Künstler* of him to whom nature seems transparent, and all realities equally recognizable, whether material or spiritual?

VOL. V.

X

Mr. Bernays has in nothing pleased us more than in his exaltation of Schiller. It almost enables us to forgive him for his inadequate appreciation of Wieland, which is not a necessary concomitant of the just censure which that great man’s warmest admirers never withhold. Exceeding, as we do, the praise that we now quote, it follows that we are pleased to meet with Schiller’s name in so many departments of the work under notice.

“If Göthe is the true poet of nature; if he loves to paint man in his dependency on circumstances, with humiliating detail; if he knows the art of reconciling us to our ‘flat, stale, and unprofitable’ existence, as exemplified in this present age; Schiller delights to raise man from the abject state of mean reality, by stirring up within him every feeling of what is true, honourable, and great in his soul. No one can rise from the perusal of a tragedy of Schiller, (with the exception, perhaps, of his two first,) or even of one of his shorter poems, without the conviction that he has conversed with one of those exalted natures which Providence occasionally sends into the world to prevent its thorough corruption.”—P. xxiv.

This collection of poems appears to us as extensive as its purpose warrants, and it is certainly very rich. Its contents are arranged in four classes,—Epics, including Fables, Parables, and Narrative Poems:—Descriptive pieces,—Didactic pieces,—and Lyrics. It may be anticipated that all variety is here comprehended, from the light raillery of Pleffel to the solemn devotion of Klopstock, and (if we may venture to say so) the sounder and more sympathetic piety of less ambitious poets.—The assistance of the notes must be valuable to those who cannot quite go alone in this land of beauties and wonders; and it is to be hoped that the facilities afforded by works like this will induce many to discover for themselves how they have been misled by the general tone of translations from the German into our tongue, and how untransfusable the best beauties of German composition are, and we imagine will ever be, as far as they are connected with the mode of expression.

ART. VI.—*The Moorish Queen; a Record of Pompeii; and other Poems.* By Eleanor Snowden. pp 166. Longman. 1831.

THE descriptive beauties of Miss Snowden’s poems afford assurance that she has that within which will in time prompt

to greater things than she has yet achieved,—to a fuller and freer expression of feeling and discrimination of sentiment. Her poetry at present consists of description and narrative. When she shall have learned to impart to it the deeper and richer charm which we are sure she has to bestow, she will be disposed to confine her efforts within narrower limits, and to make the beauties of her verse relieve each other by a greater force both of contrast and concentration.

We extract the descriptive opening of the principal poem of the volume, and a passage which we are sorry to perceive is the only one of its kind:

“ Bathing his golden glories in the main,
The setting sun shines o’er romantic Spain;
The Pyrenean mountains’ loftiest height,
The peak, the passing cloud impending o’er,
Where scarce the venturous eagle dares to soar,
Is circled with a crown of crimson light.

On the smooth slope of yonder beetling rock
The lonely goatherd tends his browsing flock,
And sings his simple Andalusian lay;
How musically falls the clear cascade,
Bubbling and brawling through the sylvan shade,
That spreads its coolness o’er the craggy way!

In full fertility below expand
The undulatory beauties of the land;
Vineyards and valleys rich with rip’ning grain;
The picturesque and endless interchange
Of chesnut wood, Sierra’s frowning range,
The drear ravine and olive-teeming plain.

The citron groves, the cork-tree shaded dells,
Whence the soft echo of the vesper bells
Proclaims the peaceful hour of ev’ning prayer,
Seem floating in the twilight’s purple haze
That half obscures their charms and half displays,
As the thin veil conceals the blushing fair.

Now onward glides the bright and balmy night,
The season consecrated to delight,
Welcome to all in Spain’s voluptuous clime,
Where, in the gay saloon or garden glade,
Love breathes his most impassioned serenade,
And hails with song and dance his chosen time.

More grateful than the dazzling light of noon,
Serenely smiling gleams the crescent moon.

With what a silv’ry sheen doth she surround
Yon cloister’d convent on the distant steep,
Where hooded nuns their weary vigils keep,
By holy vow irrevocable bound!”

* * * * *

“ ’Tis charming, from the trifling crowd apart,
To ope the hidden treasure of the heart,
Th’ exhaustless store Imagination yields
Of lustrous, gemlike thoughts, and feelings free,
That cast a gloss upon reality—
’Tis bliss to range her rich Utopian fields!

To follow where the smiling sibyl, Hope,
Points to the future as a flow’ry slope,
Making its hazardous ascent appear
Sun-bright and smooth; or on the twilight track
Of the dim past, by Mem’ry’s lamp look back,
Illumin’d by its mellow’d rays and clear.

In moments sad the sweet beguilers pour
A healing balm upon the fleeting hour,
The heart relieving of its brief distress;
Or in the full fruition of desire,
The visionary sisters then inspire
Chimeras fair, to crown our happiness.”—P. 63.

ART. VII.—*Poetical Ditties for Children*. Compiled from various Authors. London. 1831. John Marston.

PRETTY ditties these; and such as bring back childish voices upon our ear

while we sit alone in our elderly gravity. They are freer from faults than verses for children usually are; but as we hold inaccuracies in such works to be more heinous than in those whose readers can detect faults for themselves, we point out a few expressions which need alteration. What sort of an epithet is "snow-back"? And what is a "cent" to any but an American child? The whole pretty story of the blackberries would become unreal to an English child through this one expression. Again: however terribly some little boys may swear, may other little boys speak of their "abominable mouths"? There is faulty grammar too, here and there. If parents will take pen in hand to rectify these few errors, they will have a very pretty book to please and improve their children with.

ART. VIII.—*Castle's Manual of Surgery*. 3d edit. 10s. 6d.

Castle's Introduction to Medical Botany. 5s.

WE have before had occasion to praise and recommend the useful compendia of which Mr. Castle is so industrious a compiler. Both those now before us are entitled to commendation; and the *Manual of Surgery*, especially, is a book with which every professional student should provide himself. "The mere walking from one ward to another, and taking a cursory view of the patient, is not a proper plan to be pursued; they should take with them a pocket companion, and when they meet with any particular case, they should first make their own observations, and then immediately refer to know what they have overlooked, or what is unusual to its general character." Such is the "pocket companion" which our author has here supplied. His chief materials are derived from the lectures of Sir Astley Cooper; those of J. H. Green, Esq.; and S. Cooper's Dictionary of Surgery.

OBITUARY.

LIEUT.-COL. HUGH ROBERT ALCOCK.

1831. Feb. 24, in *North Town*, near *Taunton*, after a few hours' illness, Lieut.-Col. HUGH ROBERT ALCOCK, Hon. East India Company's Service, in the 85th year of his age. If the eulogy of the living could render a suitable tribute to the memory of departed worth, it would then be a pleasing employment to dilate on the numerous excellencies which exalted and adorned the character of this truly venerable man. We have never known an individual to whom the language of an admired poet (though originally descriptive of an aged minister) could be so well accommodated:

"Though old, he still retain'd
His manly sense and energy of mind.
Virtuous and wise he was, but not severe;
He still remember'd that he once was young;
His easy presence check'd no moderate joy.
Him, even the dissolute admired; for he
A graceful looseness, when he pleased,
put on,
And laughing could instruct. Much had
he read,

More had he seen; he studied from the life,

And in the original perused mankind."

In the social circle our late friend shone with peculiar eminence, scattering smiles around, and exciting feelings of "gladness and deep joy" in the hearts of all who came within the sphere of his influence. Wherever he appeared, his general intelligence, the playfulness of his wit, the cheerfulness of his disposition, and the urbanity of his manners, rendered him a delightful guest. To a mind richly stored with knowledge, he also added the *wisdom* which leads its possessor to adapt his means to the attainment of the best ends. He had early discovered that "Virtue alone is happiness below," and to the culture of it, in its various relations, he directed all the energies of his nature. Amply did the fruits reward his toil. He secured for himself the enjoyment resulting from the pursuit of useful labours, from having endeavoured, by a course of honourable exertion, to leave the world better than he found it, and from the possession of a well-grounded hope of the favour of God to eternal life. He obtained

the respect and esteem of all who had the pleasure of his acquaintance, and went down to the grave, in a green old age, deeply and sincerely lamented. For the greater part of his life, our excellent but now departed friend was connected with the Established Church, in whose principles he had been educated. Subsequently, however, he became a convert to Unitarianism, and it is pleasing to be able to state, that some of the latest hours of his existence were occupied in

writing a refutation of the doctrine of the Trinity. For several years this venerable Christian adorned our religious society, and was an ornament to his profession in every relation of domestic and social life. We now mourn his decease; for by his removal from this sublunary state, consistency has lost an advocate, virtue a patron, and humanity a friend.

Taunton, March 17, 1831.

INTELLIGENCE.

Parliamentary Reform.

THE excitement in which the whole nation has been kept by the discussions on this vital question was increased by the result of the division on the second reading on the 22d ult. A majority of one in a House of 603 members affords little hope of getting the Bill through the Committee without mutilation. A dissolution of Parliament may therefore be expected. The Bill has united the nation; it has been cheerfully acquiesced in and zealously supported by those who had previously petitioned for more extensive changes; and for Ministers to allow it to pass in an enfeebled and crippled form would destroy that public confidence in them which is now the chief barrier against desperation and confusion. Every thing depends upon their firmness. To those who would perpetuate the present corrupt system, with the evils, now become so enormous and intolerable, which flow from it, they must concede nothing. The nation has a right to expect this at their hands; and the nation, we feel assured after what has passed, will not be disappointed by their conduct. In the event of a dissolution, the people, or rather those who by possessing votes are the people's trustees in this matter, will have to do *their* duty. It will be a very simple, though a very momentous task. Let them beware of entangling themselves by promises. Let them look out for men whose political principles, capacity, and integrity, are above all doubt. The next parliament must give us peace or confusion. Let no vote be given but for men who are equal to the crisis. Local influences,

old connexions, every thing must be disregarded in the paramount consideration of returning a House of Commons that will save the country. In the present state of the suffrage it is comparatively little which the people *can* do; but let them do it all; it will prove to be enough.

Porter versus Clark.

THE "Legal Observer" (a Weekly Journal of Jurisprudence) of 19th ult. contains a case of some importance to Dissenters, which has recently been decided before the *Vice-Chancellor*. It may be useful to give it insertion in the Repository, as many Trust Deeds of our chapels are defective as regards the election and dismissal of ministers.

Porter versus Clark.

"A chapel and buildings were vested in trustees, upon the following trusts: to permit and suffer the said messuage, meeting-house, buildings, and premises, to be used as and for a place for the worship of Almighty God, by the congregation of Protestants dissenting from the Church of England, under the denomination of Particular Baptists, holding the doctrine of personal election, imputation of original sin, effectual calling, free justification, and final perseverance of the saints, and by the members and successors of the same congregation of Protestants holding the same doctrines. Shortly before the filing of the bill, differences had arisen in the congregation; some of the members being desirous of appointing Owen Clark to be co-pastor with Porter, while others were averse to

such appointment. However, on the 13th of March, 1828, a church meeting was held, at which it was resolved to invite Clark to preach at the chapel for three months, as a probationer to be co-pastor with Porter. Clark came accordingly, and at the end of that period was elected joint minister with Porter. To this election Porter refused to consent, alleging that the congregation had not the power to appoint a co-pastor without such consent; further disputes and differences were the consequences of this refusal, and eventually, on the 6th of November, 1828, a church meeting was held, at which it was resolved that Porter should be no longer pastor, and that the defendant Clark should, from that time, be sole pastor; and on the following Sunday Porter was forcibly prevented from entering the pulpit, and Clark, the defendant, took possession of it.

"There was no endowment for the minister, nor any trust property, except the chapel and premises, nor was the minister paid by the pew-rents, but solely by the voluntary contributions of persons attending the chapel.

"The bill was filed by Porter, by the trustees of the chapel, and by two of the members of the congregation, on behalf of themselves and all the other members, except such as were made defendants, against Clark and nine of the members, by whose orders Porter had been forcibly expelled. It prayed that the trusts upon which the premises were held might be ascertained and declared, and carried into execution, by and under the direction and decree of the court, so far as it might be deemed proper or necessary; and that a sufficient number of proper persons might be appointed new trustees, in the room of such as were dead, or desirous of being released from the burden of their trust; and that it might be declared that Porter was the lawful pastor and minister of the chapel and congregation, and that he might be quieted in the possession of such rights as appertained to him in that capacity; and also, that the defendant Clark might be restrained by the injunction of the court from performing the duty of pastor or minister of the chapel and congregation, or officiating or performing divine worship in the chapel, that he and the defendants might be restrained, in like manner, from impeding, or in any manner interfering with Porter in the exercise of his duties as pastor and minister thereof.

"A motion was now made for an injunction in the terms of the prayer. In

support of the motion numerous affidavits, made by Dissenting ministers of this denomination, were read, who all agreed, that when a minister has been duly elected to be pastor of a congregation, and has been ordained according to the form usual amongst them, he held this office until he thinks fit to decline it; and that no person, or body of persons, has power to remove him, or to appoint a co-pastor with him, without his consent.

"The *Vice-Chancellor* said, that he had looked into the deed creating the trust, and that he could find no directions as to the mode of electing ministers, or as to the duration of their office, when elected; neither could he find that there was any provision made for the minister by the trust deed; but that he was dependent entirely on the voluntary contributions of the members of the congregation: and he, therefore, could not see that the plaintiff, Porter, had made any case for the interference of the court.

"His Honour added, that independently of the want of jurisdiction, he was of opinion that it was very reasonable that a minister who depended entirely upon voluntary contributions, should be dismissible at will by the persons so voluntarily contributing."

Complaint from the Pulpit against the Oxford University.

ON Sunday se'nnight, the Rev. Mr. Bulteel, late Fellow of Exeter College, and Curate of St. Ebbe's parish, in Oxford, preached before the University, and a very numerous congregation, at St. Mary's. The subject was from 1 Cor. xi. 12. In the course of his discourse he launched out against "all the Doctors, both the Proctors, the Heads, and Governors of Colleges and Halls, and their respective societies." None were spared, and unceremonious epithets were applied to the Fellows and Tutors. They were charged with want of due discrimination in giving out *testimoniums* for holy orders. The drunken and the wicked, he said, too often obtained them, while the pious and the moral were frequently refused. He pointed out the necessity of reform in the Church, and spoke of other University matters in the strongest language of censure. Never was curiosity more excited, or St. Mary's Church so full. After the sermon the High street was nearly as full as it was when the King was proclaimed. The sermon has since been printed, and in the short space

of three days nearly 3,000 copies have been circulated, the profits of which are to be given to the Benevolent Society. Some "Remarks on the Sermon" have since been printed, written by the Regius Professor of Divinity.

Church Reform.

At a meeting of twenty-eight clergymen of the diocese of Chester, at Knutsford, last week, petitions were adopted, expressing the belief of the subscribers that a modification of the liturgy, and an equivalent for tithes, would tend to the interests, influence, and purity of the church.—*World*, Feb. 28.

Dissenters' Marriages in Canada.

The *Christian Guardian*, published under the direction of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, of the date of the 15th ult., states that the learned Attorney-General had introduced a bill into the House of Assembly, to authorise ministers of various religious denominations to solemnize matrimony between persons of their own communion.—*Ibid*.

French Catholics.

THE French papers mention the opening of "a French Catholic Church" in the street Souricière St. Honoré; the priests of which propose to celebrate the Mass in the national language. They will also exercise all the functions of the ministry without receiving any stipulated payment. Each worshiper will contribute what he pleases. In several districts of France measures have already been taken for establishing this "new church," and the pastors have already been chosen. It also appears that the doctrines which the professors adopt deny any impediments to marriage, excepting those which are indicated by the Civil Code.

Present State of Greece.

(Letter from His Excellency the Count of Capo d'Istrias to his late confidential secretary, M. Belant, of Geneva, dated Nauplia, Dec. 2, 1830.)

You request me to give you some details concerning the internal organization of our country. I will endeavour to satisfy you, as far as my numerous occupations allow me to do it; but you know how few spare minutes I can command.

I have sent your letter to Mustodoxi,

and I hope very soon to see him at Egina myself, when I shall act as your functionary in my character of citizen of Geneva. Our little collection of antique relics becomes every day more interesting; and if we were to spend all that is required in excavating, it would be much more so; but I am in no hurry about it, for I hope we shall have no more travellers come to steal them from us.

Egina is no longer the seat of government, but it is the centre of all our establishments for public instruction. Besides the Orphanotrophe, (asylum for orphans,) where 500 young persons are receiving their education, there are two normal schools, the one on the plan of mutual instruction, the other for instruction in the ancient Greek language, philology, the elements of the exact sciences, drawing, music, &c. This second school is called after Mr. Eynard, because it was built and established at his expense. A spacious and noble printing-office is always at work, preparing useful works in the Greek language. The money which was remitted to me recently by the committee at Geneva has been appropriated to the payment of M. Didot for a great part of what this printing establishment had cost us, as you will have the kindness to inform M. Favre, M. Munier, &c.

The different schools of Egina, including the orphan school, contain more than 1500 pupils, and their progress is very satisfactory. In all the provinces great activity prevails in the course of education. All of them contain one or two schools of mutual instruction, and they give us a total of above 10,000 scholars. In a short time all will be established according to the method of Sarasin, and by masters who shall have been trained in the normal (model) school at Egina.

The military school at Nauplia is quite as encouraging. In the public examination of this year, the pupils distinguished themselves beyond all expectation. A seminary has been lately instituted in the magnificent convent at Poros. It requires a close and diligent attention, which I hope to be able to bestow upon it myself.

Lastly, thanks once more to the bounty of M. Eynard, a model farm is established at Tyrinthe. M. Paléologue, who has been trained in the institution of M. Dombâle, presides over it, and has already sixty pupils, of whom he hopes to make good practical agriculturalists.

Nauplia begins to rise out of its ruins, and wears every day more and more the

appearance of a town. The cottages which I had built two years ago, in a spot which was intended for a faubourg, are disappearing, and giving place to handsome and commodious houses. It is called the Faubourg of Pronia, or Providence.

The line of a great road leading to Argos is almost completed, and the journey thither is made in an hour and a quarter. The appearance of Argos is very striking: more than one hundred and fifty new white houses have risen up; and if the same activity continues, it will soon become a handsome city.

In my frequent excursions, I have reason to be convinced, that in all the provinces some improvement is taking place. The inhabitants enjoy their tranquillity, and labour to ameliorate their condition. As soon as their external improvement shall have arrived at a certain degree, the moral improvement of the people will follow of course. The schools, also, must largely contribute to this. It is impossible to be well acquainted with the present situation of Greece, without being convinced that this country is making immense advances towards its moral and political regeneration. There still are some persons, natives and foreigners, who see things differently; they imagine it to be enslaved by its government, which does not yet call upon the people to take a constitutional part in its affairs. Every one is free to entertain his own opinion, but I cannot see any reason to change my own, or to alter my line of conduct. The more ardently I desire to see Greece restored to the rank of a free and independent nation, the more anxious do I feel to procure for her the means of arriving at this grand object in the shortest possible period—and to do this, I ought always to keep in mind the state to which she has been reduced by four centuries of servitude, and eight years of anarchy.

As soon as Greece shall have risen above her misfortunes by her own efforts, that is by labour, she will provide herself with constitutional laws. The elements of these laws are all prepared. They are already in action in each of the branches whose successive development will grow into constitutional order. The senate is established for legislation, the ministers and the governors of provinces for the administration of the laws, and the tribunals for justice. All these institutions, in my opinion, are so many schools where our magistrates and rulers will be formed. The schools, properly

so called, of agriculture, of commerce, of navigation, of the arts, will give us citizens truly worthy of the name.

I have given you these particulars, my dear friend, because I know that some persons entertain a contrary opinion, though I am persuaded you will never adopt it. I am very far from seeking the approbation of all men: let me but obtain it from those who conscientiously wish well to Greece, without being bigoted to any system. These are my inducements for giving you this rapid sketch of the state of the country, and of those principles from which its government is not disposed to depart.—*From the Journal of Geneva.*

American Unitarian Dedication and Ordinations.

Nov. 3. The New Unitarian Church in Province Town, dedicated.

Nov. 10. Mr. James Augustus Kendall, from the Cambridge Theological School, ordained as Minister of the First Congregational Church and Society in Medfield.

Nov. 17. Mr. William Barry, from the Theological School in Cambridge, ordained as Pastor of the South Congregational Church Society in Lowell.

Dec. 8. Mr. Josiah Moore, from the Theological School in Cambridge, ordained as Minister of the Congregational Church and Society in Athol.

Dec. 8. Rev. Hezekiah Packard, D. D., installed as Minister of the North Congregational Church and Society in Chelmsford (Middlesex Village).

Dec. 9. Mr. Jonathan Farr, from the Cambridge Theological School, ordained as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Gardner.

At the close of 1830, the number of Unitarian ministers settled during the year over Unitarian societies in New England will be about twenty-four; equal, on an average, to two a month. Most of them received their theological education at the Cambridge Divinity School.

A List of the Committee of Deputies, appointed to Protect the Civil Rights of the Three Denominations of Dissenters, for the year 1831.

Chairman, William Smith, Esq., 36, Upper Seymour Street, Portman Square; Deputy Chairman, Henry Weymouth, Esq., 17, Bryanston Square; Treasurer, William Hale, Esq., Homerton; Mr. Serjeant Bompas, 9, King's Bench Walk, Temple; Robert Bousfield, Esq., Manor

House, Walworth; William Bousfield, Esq., 12, St. Mary Axe; James Baldwin Brown, Esq., LL.D., 3, Hare Court, Temple; Edward Busk, Esq., 13, Old Square, Lincoln's Inn; Thomas Challis, Esq., 34, Finsbury Square; Evan Edwards, Esq., Denmark Hill; John Evans, Esq., 4, Gray's Inn Square; Thomas Gillespy, Esq., 12, Billiter Street; Benjamin Hanbury, Esq., Temple Place, Blackfriars Road; William Alers Hankey Esq., 7, Fenchurch Street; Samuel Houston, Esq., 31, Great St. Helen's; Samuel Jackson, Esq., Clapham; Robert H. Marten, Esq., Commercial Rooms, Mincing Lane; John Remington Mills, Esq., 20, Russell Square; Benjamin Shaw, Esq., 72, Cornhill; Isaac Sewell, Esq., Salters' Hall; Richard Taylor, Esq., Red Lion Court, Fleet Street; John Wilks, M. P., 3, Finsbury Square; Thos. Wood, Esq., Little St. Thomas Apostle; William Yockney, Esq., Bedford Street, Covent Garden.

ROBERT WINTER, Secretary.
16, Bedford Row.

Manchester College, York.

At the Forty-fifth Annual Meeting of the Trustees of "Manchester College, York," held in Cross-Street Chapel-Rooms, Manchester, on Thursday, the 24th March instant, Nathaniel Philips, Esq., in the Chair,

It was resolved unanimously,

That the grateful thanks of this Meeting be given to Joseph Godman, Benjamin Cotton, and John Coles Symes, Esqrs., and the other parties beneficially interested in the estate of the late Richard Godman Temple, Esq., of Bath and Roehampton, in the county of Surrey, for their munificent benefaction of One Thousand Pounds for the general purposes of the College.

S. D. DARBISHIRE, } Secretaries.
J. J. TAYLER, }
Manchester, March 24, 1831.

NOTICES.

THE premium of Ten Guineas for the best Essay on the Evidence of the Acts and St. Paul's Epistles as to the form or mode of Christian Baptism, (vide Mon. Repos. for November last, p. 800,) has been awarded to the Rev. H. Green, of Knutsford.

THE Ninth Anniversary of the Unitarian Congregation assembling in the Meeting-house, Moor Lane, Bolton, will be held on Easter Sunday, April 3rd. The Rev. J. Cropper, A. M., will preach in the morning; and the Rev. J. Thom, of Toxteth Park, Liverpool, in the afternoon and evening. The congregation and friends will dine together on the Monday.

Society for the Relief of the Widows and Children of Protestant Dissenting Ministers.

THE Annual Sermon, recommending this Institution, will be preached by the Rev. John Burnett, Camberwell, on Wednesday, the 13th of April, at the Rev. John Clayton's Chapel, Poultry. Service to begin at Twelve o'clock precisely.

The subscribers and friends of the Society will dine together at the Albion, Aldersgate Street, on the same day.

The Annual General Meeting of the subscribers and friends of the Society will be held on Tuesday, the 26th day of April, at the Queen's Arms, Cheapside, at One o'clock precisely, to receive a Report of the Proceedings during the past year; to choose a Treasurer, Secretary, and Committee of Managers, for the year ensuing; and to transact the other usual business of the Annual Meeting.

The following motion will be discussed at the General Meeting:

"That the Widows of such Ministers of the Scotch Secession Church, resident in England, as at the time of their death were recognized by the Presbyterian Ministers of their respective neighbourhoods, as belonging to their denomination, be eligible to receive allowances from this Fund, under the same regulations as the widows of other Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist Denominations."

THE Annual Association of the Kent Unitarian General Baptists will be held at Cranbrook, on Tuesday, May 3, on which occasion the Rev. John Marten, of Dover, is expected to preach. The public service will commence at eleven o'clock in the morning.